ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE Extra

Agenda
Tuesday, November 10, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Videoconference

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   November 3, 2020 Minutes

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart)
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam)
      iii. FAC (M. Rees)
      iv. BPC (B. Street)
   b. Provost Update
   c. Searches
   d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – PBTF
   e. Ally Software
   f. Zoom Lecture Recordings

6. NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS
   a. Elections and Appointments (handout)
      i. School Elections Committees
      ii. Committee proliferation
   b. UPRC Changes (handout)
   c. APM Proposal – GECCo (handout)
   d. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (handout)
   e. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term
   f. Post-Tenure Review Requirements
   g. Handbook 306.2.2.e (handout)
   h. Campus Data Needs
   i. Syllabi Accessibility (handout)
j. Sabbatical Application Procedures
k. URC Recommendations (handout)
l. Proposal for creation of a Department of Ethnic Studies (handout)
m. Graduate student grievances and appeals (handout)

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 12, 2020** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)

Announcements
President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)

Reports

Resolutions

Consent Agenda
New Business
RES 202110 Academic Calendar Fall ’20 Spring ’21 Fall ’21 Spring ’22 Summer ’22
RES 202111 Graduate Student Grievances and Appeals

Old Business
RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies

Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 11:15)
Past Senate Chair, Vandana Kohli (Time Certain 11:20)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Minutes
Tuesday, November 3, 2020
10:00 a.m. – 11:28 a.m.
Videoconference

Members: A. Hegde, M. Danforth, J. Millar, M. Martinez, M. Rees, R. Gearhart, C. Lam, B. Street, D. Boschini, V. Harper

Absent: D. Boschini

1. CALL TO ORDER
   A. Hegde called the meeting to order.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, INFORMATION AND WELLNESS CHECK
   • Q&A RES 202109 Feedback for Second Reading – Debrief
   A. Hegde said there was good discussion of the resolution and those attending had relevant questions, comments, and concerns. The notes from the meeting were sent to the EC. There were changes to RES 202109 as recommended by M. Danforth. He thanked everyone for their feedback to the resolution. The changes will be made to RES 202109 and presented in the Second Reading, November 12. By that time, we’ll know what the Chancellor’s Office (CO) has done with the Feedback on CSU GE Draft EO submitted November 2. The people in attendance to the Q&A session also discussed the formation of a resolution in opposition to the process. C. Lam stated opposition to the mandate that the campus add ES sections without the funds. A. Hegde said that will be included in the new resolution. It appears that all the CSUs are opposing the implementation process. J. Millar said that the ASCSU AA chair is compiling specifics to then parse the key points in the resolutions. It will be a big part of the discussion at the state-wide AA meeting next week. A. Hedge said there is one more meeting between the CO, ASCSU, and the Council of Ethnic Studies to discuss the core competencies and Student Learning Outcomes.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   M. Martinez moved to approve the October 27, 2020 Minutes. R. Gearhart seconded. Approved by a show of hands.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA (Time Certain 10:05)
   M. Rees suggested adding URC Recommendations, and Sabbatical Applications.
C. Lam moved to approve the Agenda with the two additions. R. Gearhart seconded. Approved by a vote.

5. CONTINUED ITEMS
   a. AS Log (handout)
      i. AAC (R. Gearhart) No new issues.
      ii. AS&SS (C. Lam) No new issues.
      iii. FAC (M. Rees) Referral 2020-2021 02 Faculty Awards and concerns – when it came up in discussion in EC last year, the concern was getting the department’s support or non-support for their nominations. She addressed that in an email to chairs. A. Hegde said perhaps we can clarify in the Handbook with stronger language along with addressing the nomination process such that one only needs one individual to nominate and multiple signatures are not necessary. M. Rees said that the FHAC doesn’t look at what’s going on in a department nor at the number of signatures. FAC will look at whether something needs to be codified in the Handbook.
      iv. BPC (B. Street) the committee will be working on the Academic Calendar.
   b. Provost Update – V. Harper
      • Wellness Activity Halloween celebration went well. Yoga tomorrow.
      • Institutional Plan for Spring 2021 – the draft was shared with the EC. He welcomed feedback. Due to CO November 6, 2020.
      • CFA – D. Gove and E. Jackson provided good exchange at the meeting yesterday.
      • Mid-year TOPS Training – a smaller, more advanced version of TOPS training will be offered over winter break to enhance faculty skills in digital education.
      • CSUB Ranking – We have increased our rankings quite substantially. We were not overly concerned in the recent years. We don’t see ourselves as competing in the CSU rankings. The most popular rankings appear in the US World & News Report, Best Colleges. There are regionally university lists. We are in the West region. We were #94 of 126 in 2018. This year we’re #52. A large amount is due to GI 2025, faculty research, alumni giving rates. The campus jumped 40 spots in three years. There will be some public relations messages. We will
continue to be ourselves. Our peer assessment went from 2.7 to more than 3.0. It has to do what faculty does to get out in the community. It has to do with what M. Martinez is doing with The Law Project, and with R. Gearhart, N. Michieka appearing on the radio and community events to explain economic issues. A. Hegde is looking for the ranking to result in dollars for campus to continue our work for the students and greater community.

• Recording and preserving instruction memo going out soon. V. Harper will have an open forum to inform and answer questions. It’s an opportunity to work together and create an open environment for students and others to express themselves before the change takes place. See NEW DISCUSSION a. Zoom Lecture Recording.

\[\text{c. Searches – V. Harper}\]

• Interim Dean NSME – T. McBride accepted the position
• AVP AA and Dean AA – committee to meet
• Dean Library – good conversation with the chair. (4) Candidates coming next week.
• Faculty Affairs closes in January
• AV Dean closes in January
• AA Analyst - L. Bishop is onboarding.
• AVP Institutional Research - K. Krishnan – The Interim is relocating. M. Malhotra is motivated and comes with an impressive skill set.
• Permanent Dean NSME – Committee is meeting.
• AVP GGrASp - I. Ebong will be retiring in early 2021. V. Harper will not replace that position. This will be a savings. He is contemplating a faculty member to help evaluate GGrASp in the Spring. C. Lam asked if the Academic Administrator Review will continue. V. Harper referenced precedent and he is in favor of having the AARC do the work. B. Street said that GGrASp is key to help junior faculty and to help our students if we are expected to grow. V. Harper said the hold will be temporary. It gives him an opportunity to be closer to the position. The goal is to balance growth in MPPs and the growth in research. M. Danforth asked if there would be a call for general faculty input or he will appoint a faculty member? V. Harper replied that he’s considering whether a call is warranted. When he did the evaluation of the FTLC, he selected individuals for that. There are some talented people who could really help the Provost. He has a draft call to faculty to serve in the Spring, with one course release. M. Martinez suggested that the review of GGrASp include reviewing the process once someone has a grant. A $250K grant was lost because of people going about policing every minor detail. We need to recreate a culture that supports
what happens once a grant is received. V. Harper is committed to making sure all administrative units work optimally. It will take some time to get to best practices. A. Hegde said GRaSP is a work in process and if we do it right, there is an opportunity to bring money to campus and hopefully new leadership will lead to that. Whoever comes in can be updated on the issues. V. Harper said there will be continuing evaluation. We are going to have an incredible team to lead into the future.

d. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation – PBTF is working on recommendations.

e. Ally Software – should it be automatically turned on? Hold off on discussion until we get the accessible syllabi referral. Goal: The material is accessible and all students can access materials. M. Danforth is faculty rep on ATI. The Instructional Materials area falls short. There is a meeting today. The CO is expecting a lot. We’ve made progress. Handbook Appendix K is the Instructional Materials Access Plan (IMAC). FTLC has TOPs training. It’s a large area and an ad hoc committee may not be enough to cover it all. It may be substantiated to become a university wide committee. A. Hegde thanked her for representing faculty on the ATI.

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**

a. Zoom Lecture Recordings (Guest: F. Gorham) – V. Harper gave context. We are in litigation as a system. The plaintiff states that this transition to virtual education was detrimental to students. Distance learning is a detrimental modality, so they are suing. As part of the case, the plaintiffs made a request that the Zoom files be preserved and recorded at all CSUs. Currently, faculty have the option of recording their classes. Faculty can delete files at any time. Chief Counsel at CO directed the campus to preserve all Zoom lectures and instruction. President Zelezny, F. Gorham, C. Catota and chief counsel were involved on the timing to comply and the protocol going forward. The letter directed to the campus from CO asks for specific things regarding Zoom lectures. Beginning Spring 2021, all Zoom lectures would be captured and preserved. They will be reviewed by the plaintiff. It is problematic and we are expecting a directive from the Chancellor. F. Gorham said once we are instructed by the technical team, we will implement the system. If faculty record to the cloud, it will no longer be able to be deleted. M. Danforth asked 1) what if a faculty member doesn’t opt to record, and 2) what is the line between an EC meeting like this, a student advising meeting, FHAC or any meeting containing confidential material. F. Gorham replied that initially there is no distinction when there is any kind of litigation hold. There is a
specific set of text instructions, search criteria submitted to the chief security office as we look at the material that’s available to us. For example, doing that in an email inbox or a simple request for a file in the hard drive. There would be a similar set of criteria we would go through to look at the recording for the legal team. They would make the discernment. V. Harper read from the draft communication. The CO directed all campuses to preserve all instructional Zoom content from Spring 2021. CSUB should remove the delete capability for Zoom users. The two stages: 1) we remove capability of faculty to delete recordings. 2) in Spring all instructional content will be recorded and preserved. M. Danforth asked how we distinguish confidential meetings? Do we set up separate Zoom meetings? F. Gorham replied that we don’t have fine grain control to distinguish those courses or classes that have subject and course number and those meetings that do not. V. Harper - They will be picked up on the back end. CSU plans to take it to a judge. A. Hegde said that currently the students are informed, and then consent to being recorded. Will students be informed? They may choose to turn off their cameras. V. Harper replied that this is the front end of communication. He talked to CFA yesterday. He plans to have a forum or a Provost’s Hour. Then he’ll go to ASI. There will be a statement to include in all syllabi for Spring. R. Gearhart asked if course meetings outside class hours, such as extraneous review sessions, be recorded or is one free to choose? Will the recordings be housed for eternity? He suggested that the Provost’s communication warn faculty to be careful what they say. There could be exposure to other lawsuits. V. Harper replied that there will be a lot of communication on the implications to teaching classes, etc. He has taught classes with sensitive discussion and wouldn’t have wanted them to be recorded. Anytime people know that something is being recorded, it changes things. There has been a discussion in Cabinet that we’re not able to really distinguish between instructional content and non-instructional content. If we can’t distinguish, counsel will tell us to keep all recordings. F. Gorham said that the CO has agreed to pay for extra storage. CSUB has the bandwidth to run all classes. If faculty uses a separate platform than Zoom, faculty will be asked to record and preserve. J. Millar said that HIPPA laws guided Counseling to not use Zoom. F. Gorham said that because counseling is a separate entity from instruction, they do not have the same impact. M. Danforth surmised since there is a separate guideline for HIPPA what about advising sessions or department meetings to get students to certain services. Is there a way to get things that need to be confidential separate as HIPPA? F. Gorham said CICO reviewing risks and is looking at alternatives. We could move some activities to MS Teams or set up a
Zoom instance for CSUB classes. A. Hegde said we’ll wait to see what we need to do. Hopefully, the judge will rule in CSU’s favor. He thanked V. Harper for informing the EC early and for F. Gorham for attending the meeting to answer questions.

b. IRB Response to EC Questions and Appointments
   i. IRB re-appointment as alternate member - The EC approved I. Sumaya November 2020-November 2023.
   ii. IRB re-appointment Tunson – EC approved T. Tunson as the community member on the IRB, October 2020-October 2023.
   iii. IRB re-appointment Williamson – J. Williamson approved to the scientific concern position, September 2020-September 2023.
   iv. IACUC re-appointment as alternate member – I. Sumaya approved.

c. Wang Award – FHAC recommendation approved by the EC:
   i. Outstanding Faculty Scholarship - M. Attaran – Management and Marketing
   ii. Outstanding Faculty Innovator in Student Success - C. Lam - Mathematics

d. Elections and Appointments
   i. Appointments to TEAC – A. Kemp – Mathematics, and D. Sandles – Teacher Education to serve term
   ii. Appointment to USP&BAC – J. Tarjan appointed as Faculty Alternate for two years, 2020-2022.
   iii. School Elections Committees (deferred)
   iv. Committee proliferation (deferred)

e. BS in Public Health Proposal – referred to AAC and BPC
f. Master of Science in Accounting Proposal - referred to AAC and BPC
g. UPRC Changes (deferred)
h. APM Proposal – GECCo (deferred)
i. FYS Instructors and GECCo structure (deferred)
j. EEGO course offerings – Summer Term (deferred)
k. Post-Tenure Review Requirements (deferred)
l. Handbook 306.2.2.e (deferred)
m. Campus Data Needs (deferred)
n. Syllabi Accessibility (deferred)
o. URC Recommendations (deferred)
p. Sabbatical Applications (deferred)

7. AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING NOVEMBER 12, 2020 (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
Announcements
President Zelezny (Time Certain 10:10)
Approval of the Agenda (10:05)
Reports
Resolutions
   Consent Agenda
   New Business
   RES Academic Calendar
Old Business
   RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies

Open Forum and Wellness Check (Time Certain 11:15)
Past Senate Chair, Vandana Kohli (Time Certain 11:20)

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   Topic: Student Misconduct – J. Millar said that R. Alvarez, Director of the Office of Student Rights and Responsibilities (OSRR), expected a resolution on the implementation of [RES 192013 Response to the Student Misconduct Task Force Report](#). M. Danforth said the RES 192013 was meant to be an interim resolution while faculty worked on communication and OSSR took action on 1) OSRR’s annual report to the Senate of anonymized data about academic integrity violations and sanctions, 2) the dotted-line reporting of OSRR to AA, the Registrar, and Student Affairs 3) OSRR’s communication with the reporting faculty members when academic integrity violations are reported. J. Millar will inform OSSR that faculty is forming another round of educational pieces regarding academic integrity violations with the expectation that OSSR is working on their side of the issue too.
   Topic: Special Senate meeting November 19 - Yes, it will be an opportunity to get the second reading on the Academic Calendar and to leave it open to respond to the CO.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**
   A. Hegde adjourned the meeting at 11:28.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/1/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 16 Program Review Process Improvement</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AAC Streamline the process upon looking at minimum federal requirements and the current Academic Program Review template. <strong>Addendum:</strong> Review UPRC Annual Report dated May 2020, define the purpose of the program review, clarify what Academic Programs can and cannot request, streamline the program template to one page, make the people and the process consistent with the Handbook, timely completion of self-study to effect student learning outcomes, offer assessment training workshops, and compensation for assessment coordinators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently. Returned to proposers with comments on what needs to be improved. Do the courses have a home and would the Curriculum Committees approve before it comes back to AAC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>10-29-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>AAC, BPC Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS Examine relevance of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 11 Review of Ethnic Studies Unit Implementation Task Force Recommendations</td>
<td>Second Reading 11/12/20</td>
<td>AAC Whether the (4) recommendations meet the implementation guidelines proposed by the Chancellor’s Office in their memo dated October 8, including the changes to the CSU GE Breadth Requirements. RES 202109 Changes to the GE Breadth Requirement – Ethnic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Affairs Committee: Richard Gearhart/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 12 Proposal for a Master's in Science in Accounting</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Support and Student Services: Charles Lam /Chair, meets 10:00 via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/10/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 12– Graduate Student Grievance and Appeals Policy – Reporting Chain</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>AS&amp;SS Policy alignment: University Handbook, and Catalog. The committee is waiting for the graduate policy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 10 Course Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td>AAC, AS&amp;SS Examine efficacy of data from the Academic Petitions Committee and whether policy is needed for how many times a student can repeat an individual course for forgiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Faculty Affairs Committee: Mandy Rees/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/27/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 08 Honorary Doctorate-Handbook Change</td>
<td>Carry-over</td>
<td>FAC Refer to RES 121329 Procedures for Honorary Doctorate Nominations and Selection REVISED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 02 Criteria and Nomination Process for Faculty Awards</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Define meritorious, pressure from senior faculty, confidentiality of process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 04 Office Hours Policy</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Clarify the language in Handbook 303.1.3, How to hold office hours via videoconference, Censure or penalty for missing office hours. RES 202106 Office Hours Policy During Mandated Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 05 CFA President or Designee on FAC-Bylaws Change</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>The CFA President’s knowledge of existing contracts, and emerging issues at the campus and system levels. Whether the position is voting or ex-officio member RES 202107 CFA President or Designee on FAC – Bylaws Change</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 07 Fall Classroom Observations</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>FAC Decision needs to be made before second year of RTP files on whether to have mandatory observation and the option to include in RTP, etc. RES 202105 Fall Classroom Observations During Mandatory Remote Delivery</td>
<td>09/17/20</td>
<td>09/25/20</td>
<td>10/01/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 08 Notification to Chairs of Assigned Time</td>
<td>FAC</td>
<td>Specifying the appropriate timing and notification to the department chair and how the coordination with AA and HR can improve.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Budget and Planning Committee: Brian Street/Chair, meets 10:00am via Zoom video conference

**Dates:** Sept 10, Sept 24, Oct 8, Oct 22, Nov 5, Nov 19, Dec 10, Jan 28, Feb 11, Feb 25, Mar 11, Mar 25, Apr 8, Apr 22, May 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Approved by Senate</th>
<th>Sent to President</th>
<th>Approved by President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 01 Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>AAC BPC</td>
<td>Program rationale, existing resources, additional resources required. RES 202108 Proposal for Master of Science in Computer Science</td>
<td>10-29-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
<td>11-06-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 03 Institutional Research in Response to WSCUC Report</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>Feedback from CO, access and permissions to data, what faculty needs, what data department chairs’ need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/6/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 09 Expanded Winter Session</td>
<td>AAC BPC</td>
<td>Examine whether or not the current CSUB Winter Session, based on the calendar, is a sufficient instructional period, faculty workload issues, and impact on student financial aid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/19</td>
<td>2019-2020 Referral 18 Interdisciplinary BS Degree in Public Health Proposal</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 13 BS in Public Health</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/20</td>
<td>2020-2021 Referral 12 Proposal for a Master’s in Science in Accounting</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td>The demand, structure, and resources required to deliver effectively and efficiently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Aaron,

Can’t the schools just make their own accounts on VotingPlace? They’ll have much smaller populations of voting faculty, so they would probably qualify for the lower pricing tiers. Or perhaps we need to allow other electronic voting means during the pandemic as an interim measure.

With regards to GECCo, my personal frustration is the constantly shifting goal-posts with respects to what a course needs to do in order to be approved. There also doesn’t seem to be sufficient consultation when the student learning outcomes, requirements, etc. are revised. The former is more personal, but the later speaks to a governance/structural issue. And of course, any changes to the GE structure itself needs to clearly be labeled as going through appropriate consultation and that is has Senate oversight.

Melissa

---

Hi, Melissa.

Thanks for looking in to these issues. You are absolutely correct that it has fallen on Beth to co-ordinate and at times run school elections. This is the reason I had suggested in the summer that you have a meeting with each SEC chair and discuss their charge and responsibilities. We can step in if there are any disputes that need an impartial arbitrator. The handbook is not very detailed about the process within each school. Perhaps you can ask each SEC chair to have by-laws and get them approved from the school faculty. Finally, we had stayed away from allowing SECs use Voting Place to run their elections, since it would fall on Beth to do it, as the only authorized administrator. The three of us can certainly discuss if we should make an exception during virtual delivery.

We do need to revisit GECCo structure. Before we send it out to committee, I wanted to get some more background about the central issues that need fixing. Is it just a reporting mechanism that needs to change, or are there more deeper issues/concerns. I am aware of those issues raised by some chairs in DCLC. I want to know if they are still of concern or if they have been fixed. Vernon had apparently passed along the message to Lori requesting her to address them. I was thinking of putting it as an item on the next DCLC meeting, getting some feedback, and then sending it to committee. We can certainly discuss it further at EC.

Beth, would you please amend the item on the agenda to say “FYS Instructors and GECCo
Hi Aaron,

Beth noticed at the end of the week that three of the four School Elections Committees had not run the elections for replacing termed-out members. I’ve also been having a lot of questions on the elections process, so I had a conversation with Beth and I’ve been reading up on that part of the Handbook this weekend. After all of that, I’m seeing a couple of issues, both procedural and Handbook related.

The first issue is the delineation of the duties to each SEC. The Handbook elections section reads to me like a distributed system managed and overseen by the Senate, with each SEC taking a stronger role within their school for school-based calls and elections, then reporting up to Senate regularly of nominations and outcomes. But it seems to be running in a more centralized mode, with the Senate office doing almost everything. As the campus grows, a centralized model is not going to scale. My computer science background is constantly thinking about scaling, so this leaps out at me. This is probably more procedural than Handbook-related, but something that needs to be ironed out before we get more issues as the campus grows.

More immediately related to the SEC, the SEC chair and/or the dean’s office staff should have been making sure that all the seats on each SEC are replaced as terms expire, particularly since those seats will always be school seats and will never turn into at-large seats. I think the Handbook is pretty clear here “The composition and structure of the SEC is decided by the faculty of the School”, which I would think also means each school has to run the SEC elections since they determine the composition. But given that three out of the four haven’t done that yet, perhaps we need to revise...
that Handbook line to also make it clear that each school is responsible for electing people to their SEC, following the election rules in the Handbook, and for informing the Senate office of the outcomes.

Maybe I’m overthinking things and the SEC issue is as simple as they don’t know how to run an electronic vote now that we’re working remotely and we just need to provide some training on VotingPlace to the deans’ ASCs. But I suspect there’s also some procedural and Handbook issues at play.

Second, this deep dive into elections sparked a neuron that the Senate has discussed in the past, before the pandemic, concerns about committee proliferation from a faculty workload perspective. It was set aside for very valid reasons, but now that we’ll be in remote operation for a while, Exec Committee may want to circle back to this issue again. Committee proliferation is a workload issue from several perspectives.

Third, it also sparked a neuron that we were going to have broader discussions about GECCo structure and governance this Fall, but it wasn’t on the Exec Committee agenda, other than the part about FYS instructors. But there were concerns in Spring about Senate oversight of GECCo and other GECCo-related concerns. I can’t recall how CARS operated before GECCo, other than that it delegated responsibility for Area B GE courses to the NSME Curriculum Committee. Charles was on CARS though, so he can provide more insight there.

Melissa

--
Dr. Melissa Danforth
Vice Chair, CSUB Academic Senate
Professor, Department Chair
Department of Computer & Electrical Engineering/Computer Science
California State University, Bakersfield
Office: Sci III 319
Phone: (661) 654-3180
Website: https://www.cs.csub.edu/~melissa/
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 14, 2020

TO: Dr. Aaron Hegde / Chair, Academic Senate
CC: Dr. Jinping Sun / University Program Review Committee
    Dr. Debra Jackson / Dean, Academic Programs
    Dr. Vernon Harper / Provost & Vice President, Academic Affairs

FROM: Dr. Danielle Solano / Chair, University Program Review Committee

RE: Recommendations from the UPRC for Changes to the Program Review Policy and Procedures

During Summer 2020, Dr. Jinping Sun conducted an extensive study of Academic Program Review at CSUB. In Dr. Sun’s work, she reviewed the current WSCUC guidelines and collected data on the program review process at other CSUs. Dr. Sun then used this information to recommend changes to CSUB program review documents, identify issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB, and propose recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB.

Informed by Dr. Sun’s work, the UPRC reviewed and made recommendations for changes to the current “Program Review Policy and Procedures” document. While we have attached a version with track changes, our changes were so extensive that we are highlighting them here.

Specifically, the UPRC:

1. Edited the document for clarification and removal of repetitive text.
2. Updated it to reflect current procedures.
3. In the “Program Self-Study Committee” section, clarified the role of students and/or staff in program review.
4. In the “External Review” section, clarified and updated the process for selection of external reviewers, and added a deadline for the external reviewer to submit the draft report, and a timeframe for the program to correct any factual errors to the external reviewer's report.
5. In the “School Dean Review” section, changed the Dean's Review to a requirement (as opposed to an option).
6. In the “Provost Review” section, added a deadline for completion of the MOUAP and clarified that the MOUAP should be initiated by the Office of the Provost (rather than the Dean and/or department).
7. Moved the section on Annual Reports to the end of the "Organization Structure for the Review Process" section and added additional information regarding annual reports (including a requirement that annual reports must be submitted to the UPRC).

8. Added a section on Repository and Reporting.

9. In the “Procedures for Programs with External Accreditation” section, clarified procedures for program review of accredited programs.

10. Added a section on mid-cycle reports.

11. Added a section on extensions and late program reviews.

Currently, the UPRC is working to review the program review template based on the recommendations from Dr. Sun’s report. (As this does not require Senate approval, we opted to prioritize those changes that must go through the Senate.) We also intend to create an external reviewer evaluation template. Also, we would like to note that recommendations above include more active involvement of the UPRC in the annual report process. If the Senate supports this, the UPRC would also be willing to develop a template for use in annual reports.

Attachments to this document include:

2. Revised version of the CSUB Program Review Policy and Procedures document (with track changes)
3. Revised version of the CSUB Program Review Policy and Procedures document (clean)
4. Dr. Jinping Sun’s full report “Academic Program Review at CSUB: A Continuous Improvement Process” with all nine appendices
5. WASC Program Review rubric

Please use the above documents to inform your decisions and recommendations. Do not hesitate to contact us if you require any further information.
Academic Program Review at CSUB: A Continuous Improvement Process

A Summary Report
Prepared by

Jinping Sun, Ph.D.
Professor, Public Policy & Administration
California State University, Bakersfield

August 22, 2020
On February 26, 2020, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) received reaffirmation of accreditation for a period of eight years by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). One of the recommendations made by the Commission is to “foster a culture of continuous improvement, re-establish a system for completing rigorous and consistent program reviews.” To address academic program review, CSUB will be asked, during a Special Visit by the Commission in spring 2023, to “provide:

i. Description of revised program review process and realistic program review schedule
ii. List of scheduled, performed, and completed program reviews
iii. Two examples of using program review results for continuous improvement.”

To assist with the University’s efforts to improve its academic program review process, I was appointed as a Faculty Leadership Fellow at the end of May 2020. Beginning June 1, 2020 and throughout summer 2020, I looked into academic program review at CSUB and other CSUs, interviewed program review officers from seven CSUs and based on the research, proposed some recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB. In addition, Dr. Jackson and I held weekly Zoom meetings to discuss the work I completed and to plan for next steps. The following sections summarize the tasks we accomplished at the end of summer 2020.

**WSCUC Guidelines and Academic Program Review at CSUB**

I started with a review of *WSCUC Program Review Resource Guide* (updated October 2015) that intends to “assist colleges and universities with meeting program review expectations within the WSCUC 2013 Handbook of Accreditation” (p.4). Designed as a “good practice” guide, it provides an overview of WSCUC standards for program review, definition and purpose of a program review, general principles, steps and responsibilities, key components of a program review process, and how to use program review results in planning and budgeting. Highlighted throughout the guide are three features of the program review process under the WSCUC standards: “outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development,” “evidence-based claims and decision-making,” and “use of program review results to inform planning and budgeting” (p.4).

Then I reviewed program review documents at CSUB, beginning with the website of Academic Programs where relevant academic program review information is made available to the public. Information posted on the website includes academic program review policy, procedures, and templates, instructions for annual program reports, University Program Review Committee (UPRC) Workshop in Fall 2019, Program Review Progress Report form, program review schedule, and UPRC membership for AY 2019-2020. A review of these documents shows some discrepancies in the program review policy and procedures, which are summarized in Appendix 1. I also looked into the UPRC Folder in BOX that the Office of Academic Programs maintains and the UPRC Folder in SharePoint that UPRC members share. Included in both folders are academic program review policies, procedures, and processes, UPRC Annual Reports to the Senate, program review schedule, reviews by program, MOUs, and other relevant information. Box contains additional program review information. For example, Box archives UPRC meeting agendas and minutes since AY 2010-2011 while SharePoint covers UPRC meeting agendas and minutes since AY 2015-2016. Appendix 2 compares program review documents in the UPRC folders in BOX and SharePoint.

The review of CSUB academic program review documents from these three sources (Academic Programs website, BOX, and SharePoint), in light of WSCUC standards, provides ample evidence to support the WSCUC recommendations mentioned at the beginning of this report. Specific issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB, as identified by the UPRC over the years, are listed in Appendix 3. In addition, a question came up during the first stage of the research: what information should be made publicly available on the CSUB program review website? Given the three different sources of
information that is accessible to different audiences, it might be worthwhile to discuss if additional program review information should be posted on the CSUB website.

**Academic Program Review at the Other 22 CSUs**
The second stage of the research focused on academic program review at the other 22 CSUs. I searched their websites, went through their program review documents that were available online, and identified their best practices that we might be able to emulate here at CSUB. Appendix 4 outlines what was available on each CSU’s program review website at the time of the Internet search. Note that a caveat to what is included in Appendix 4 is that not all program review information is posted on their websites—just like CSUB—and what is available online is updated on a regular basis.

The survey of other CSUs’ program review websites provides a wealth of information and good practices that may be adapted to CSUB. Based on this research, Dr. Jackson and I interviewed, via Zoom, academic program review officers from seven CSUs (including East Bay, Fresno, Long Beach, Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, and Stanislaus).\(^1\) The seven campuses were selected based on the program review information posted on their websites at the time of this research. The interviews focused on each campus’ unique program review practices as well as general contexts and procedures that may provide helpful information for improving the program review process at CSUB. Appendix 5 shows a list of people we interviewed and questions that guided our conversations.

Two themes (or principles) of academic program review that all seven CSUs emphasized during the Zoom meetings are accountability and efficiency. To the seven CSUs, academic program review is one way to hold them accountable to students, CSU Board of Trustees, WSCUC, and the public that they are providing quality educational programs. Academic program review also serves as a vehicle to promote a culture of systematic and continuous reflection and assessment for programmatic improvements on each campus, and to align with and support the mission of the department, college/school, and university. Another aspect of accountability in academic program review is to provide transparency into the assessment of student learning, as well as into institutional planning and resource allocation. To achieve the goal of accountability, all seven CSUs provide clear program review policies, procedures, and timelines, actively engage faculty, deans, staff, and other stakeholders, and post essential program review information on their websites. Secondly, academic program review takes tremendous amount of time and effort, and the seven CSUs always look for efficiency in the process. They hold regular orientations and workshops on program review, make assessment information readily available, provide templates for self-study reports, design separate guidelines for externally accredited programs to streamline their program review process, and have an effective tracking system to ensure proper and timely flow of program review documents throughout the process.

In the context of accountability and efficiency, the seven CSUs we interviewed identified the following best practices in their program review process:

- Create a culture of assessment and continuous improvement;
- Have clear program review guidelines;
- Establish clear timelines and send out reminders;
- Develop a program review data dashboard;
- Hold orientations and workshops where faculty can work on their program reviews;
- Prepare templates for self-studies, program plans, external review reports, MOUs (or action plans), and annual reports, which focus on essential reporting requirements;

\(^1\) We are indebted to the program review officers at the seven CSUs who took the time to share with us their experiences so we can benefit from the lessons they have learned.
- Assign a Program Review Committee liaison who works with a program under review and shepherds its program review process from the beginning;
- Include a faculty signature page in the self-study report to ensure all program faculty are involved in the program review;
- Have the deans’ support (such as requiring deans to reflect and comment on self-studies, program plans, external review reports, and recommendations from the Program Review Committee);
- Implement a modified program review process for externally accredited programs (such as providing a template or checklist for accredited programs, according to which they just need to address sections of program reviews that are not discussed in the accreditation reports);
- Ask programs to submit a list of potential external reviewers when they submit their self-studies and program plans, so the external reviewer visits can be coordinated and scheduled in advance;
- Involve program faculty, deans, administration, and other constituencies in the MOU meetings to discuss action plans and bring a closure to the program review process;
- Integrate annual reports into academic program review in a way that annual reports feed into periodic program reviews and there are regular follow-up activities for closing the loop; and
- Maintain staff and leadership stability in academic program review.

Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB
Following WSCUC’s guiding principles governing the program review process and drawing from the good practices of other CSUs, we recommend the following for improving academic program review at CSUB:

1. Promote a culture of student learning assessment and continuous improvement;
2. Engage faculty, Academic Senate, deans, administration, and other constituencies; and
3. Create a transparent system of accountability.

Proposed changes to address specific issues of concern in academic program review are presented in Appendix 6. Appendix 6 starts with an overview of the steps in the program review process and then addresses key components of academic program review at CSUB in the sequence in which they occur: the self-study and program plan, followed by the external review, and culminating with the MOUAPs. The documentation and reporting of program reviews is included as well to complete the program review process at CSUB (see Appendix 7 for recommendations on how to organize program review documents). Along with identified issues of concern in academic program review and proposed strategies to address them, Appendix 6 also indicates who will be responsible to implement each suggested change.

Note that:
- Some recommendations are not new. For example, reaffirming the self-study and MOUAP templates has been proposed by the UPRC multiple times over the years.
- Some recommendations have already been implemented (such as holding workshops on academic program review and submitting a Program Review Progress Report), and we need to continue and refine these practices.
- For other recommendations, there are general guidelines in place at CSUB (such as program reviews for externally accredited programs). As evidenced in other CSUs, developing a modified program review process, particularly a template or checklist, for these programs will improve the efficiency of program review process.
- Some recommendations, such as requesting a program review extension, the role of deans, and using MOUAPs as the basis for institutional planning and budgeting, need to be reinforced to ensure the consistency and rigor of academic program review at CSUB.
- New recommendations include developing a program review dashboard, integrating annual reports into academic program review process, and posting additional program review documents online. Considered as best practices by other CSUs, they underscore the accountability and efficiency of their program review process.
Meeting with the Provost and Chair of Academic Senate
To discuss the next steps, Dr. Jackson and I had a Zoom meeting with Dr. Harper and Dr. Hegde. Both Dr. Harper and Dr. Hegde expressed their support for improving academic program review at CSUB. Dr. Hegde will refer the UPRC items to the Senate Academic Affairs Committee in fall 2020.

Summary
The academic program review process at CSUB is an important way to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs in achieving excellence of student learning and to improve the quality of education on a continuing basis. As we reflect on the commendations and recommendations by WSCUC and move on to the next cycle, an examination of our current program review process as well as those of other CSUs represents the first step in our commitment to high quality academic programs.

The proposed recommendations for improving academic program review at CSUB, based on a review of all 23 CSUs, will be circulated and discussed among faculty, deans, Academic Senate, administration, and other constituencies in Fall 2020. A special focus will be on program directors/department chairs who are frontline leaders of program review and deans/associate deans who play an important role in linking academic program review to institutional planning and budgeting. To get their perspectives of the program review process, a survey of program directors/department chairs and deans/associate deans is recommended – see Appendices 8 and 9, respectively, for a list of proposed questions.

Academic program review is a faculty-driven, outcomes-based, collaborative, integrated, and continuous process, and improving program review requires a concerted effort and commitment of the entire campus community. With conversations and consultations across the campus in the upcoming years, we hope to incorporate the feedback from various groups, finalize and approve the proposed recommendations and by spring 2021, establish a timeline for when these tasks should be accomplished. Hopefully we will begin implementing the recommended changes in AY 2021-2022, and collect artifacts and make necessary revisions as we work through the process.

Appendices
Appendix 1: Suggested Changes to Program Review Documents
Appendix 2: UPRC Folders in Box and SharePoint
Appendix 3: Issues of Concern in Academic Program Review at CSUB
Appendix 4: Academic Program Review at CSUs – Information on the Website
Appendix 5: Program Review Best Practices – Interviews with other CSUs
Appendix 6: Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB
Appendix 7: Recommendations for Organizing Program Review Documents
Appendix 8: Proposed Survey of Program Directors/Department Chairs
Appendix 9: Proposed Survey of Deans/Associate Deans
As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, CSUB must actively plan for the future. An evidence-based program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The required elements of a program review are: evidence-based self-examination, assessment of student learning outcomes, evaluation of resources necessary to ensure quality, and the harmony of the program visions and plans with those of the university. Program review provides a critical reflection of who we are, where we are going, where we should be going, and how we should get there. It involves a program’s commitment and willingness to candidly evaluate goals, objectives, and activities, through outcomes-based assessment of student learning. Consequently, ever improving decisions on curriculum and budgeting of scarce resources are made when faculty use program review data to inform the decision making process.

The program review process strives to inform program decisions based upon evidence-based assessment and assessment results in turn lead to a foundation for informed budget and curricular decisions. This dynamic interplay, which is the heart of the program review, is primarily a faculty-driven process. This faculty endeavor utilizes accreditation reports (when available) and annual reports to reduce redundant reporting and to facilitate comparisons across departments, schools, and universities. Transparency and accountability is enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with budgeting, faculty lines and space requirements through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). Consequently, program review establishes a faculty reviewed process by which evidence-based claims and decision-making can be used for planning and budgeting. The program review establishes intermediate benchmarks and follow-up plans that track program progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic and university-wide academic goals and objectives.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review aims to maintain and strengthen the quality of the university's curriculum and its ability to meet the challenges of the future. Program review should be centered on the desire to provide a quality university-level program balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities and interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must provide an evidence-based determination of whether students are accomplishing the program’s learning objectives through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development. In this way, the results of program review provide the evidentiary basis for informed, transparent and accountable decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through this faculty-driven program review process, the university administration, working collaboratively with the faculty at multiple steps in the process, is better prepared to allocate scarce resources and to plan for change. Successful program review is dependent upon faculty willingness to engage in an intensive and comprehensive self-study process that uses data and honest professional discourse about the
evaluation criteria to be applied, changes in knowledge, the relationship of programs to one another, and the educational needs of students and society at large.

To achieve these purposes, faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. Such assessment demands that well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Such reviewers provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. It is expected that the program faculty use this feedback to improve student learning. Program faculty are to prepare a retrospective Self-Study and a forward looking Program Plan in advance of the next cycle of review. It is expected that the campus will systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, through negotiation of formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.

ANNUAL REPORTS

The office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) prepares data annually for each program, including the number of students, faculty, degrees granted, and instructional cost. The program is asked to update additional tables indicating the work that has been done over the last year on assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty activity, and funding plans. A narrative, not expected to exceed two pages, focuses on clarifying and explaining the data and discussing any emerging trends. If the program has a MOUAP, it is required to evaluate the extent to which it has met any program goals or benchmarks and may also report the status of agreed upon resource allocations. The cumulative data and narratives will form the foundation for the next program review.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE:

Each program conducting a review shall select a Self-Study Committee of at least three members. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee is responsible for the preparation of a Self-Study and a Program Plan (Planning) document. The committee receives a packet containing the review guidelines and deadlines, model program reviews, and other material. The chair of the department or interdisciplinary program is responsible for ensuring the completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document shall state that by a majority vote the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the Program Plan Document and the date on which approval was voted.

EXTERNAL REVIEW OR PROGRAM ACCREDITATION:

The AVPAP, in consultation with the school dean, may provide a list of available reviewers from which a program may select. When a list is not available, the program proposes an external reviewer in consultation with the AVPAP and is asked to assure the program review committee that the individual is capable of carrying out a neutral review. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs maintains a fund to pay for the external reviewer.

An external reviewer will evaluate each program as part of the program review or accreditation process. The purpose for the external reviewer is to assist the faculty to improve the quality of
their program by providing a new, comparative, and broader perspective on the program, its last seven years of operation, and its plans for the next seven years. The external reviewer will conduct an exit interview with the program faculty, the chair of the University Program Review Committee (UPRC), the appropriate school dean, and the Associate Vice President for Academic Programs and Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Studies (AVPAP), and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. The external reviewer will provide the Office of Academic Programs with a report that provides comments and recommendations regarding the program. The program faculty has the opportunity to review the report (within a reasonable time period) for factual inaccuracies and misperceptions and submit a written response. The program faculty’s written response to the External Reviewer’s report becomes part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the UPRC, the appropriate school dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW:

School deans are also responsible for assessment processes, the management of resources and strategic planning activities. The school dean, after reading the program self-study and program plan, and external reviewer's report or accreditation report, may add another review with comments and recommendations. In the case of interschool programs, all relevant deans have an opportunity to add their comments and recommendations.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW:

Upon receiving the documents written by the school dean, the Program Self-Study Committee, and the external reviewer(s), the University Program Review Committee engages in a review of the program. The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools and two at-large faculty, as well as one faculty from the Academic Senate membership selected by the Executive Committee, and as a non-voting member the AVPAP (ex officio). To ensure continuity in UPRC operation the members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each member is given five WTUs of assigned time for his/her two year service.

The UPRC will examine all documents developed during the review. On the basis of its examination the committee shall prepare its comments and recommendations. These are forwarded to the Office of Academic Programs. The UPRC shall also monitor the overall program review process, recommend changes in the policy and procedures of that process, and assure that program review findings are used transparently and with accountability to inform university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed.

PROVOST REVIEW

After examining the program review documents, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall meet with the program coordinator, the chair of the UPRC and other individuals who have roles in the resource allocation and planning process (e.g., the department and school dean) to discuss the program review and recommendations. At the close of the meeting the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, through active negotiation with the program faculty and
appropriate school dean, shall prepare a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP) for allocation of academic affairs resources to academic programs that identifies the agreed-upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support those recommendations, during the next seven years. The program faculty and the school dean shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations.

Copies of the documents from each program review shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate office. Copies of the concluding Memorandum of Understanding Action Plan (MOUAP) for allocation of academic affairs resources to academic programs negotiated between the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the program faculty and the appropriate school dean will be sent to the Academic Senate, the appropriate school dean, the chair of the UPRC, and the chair of the Program Self-Study Committee. Finally, at the end of the academic year the AVPAP shall circulate a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL REVIEW FOR ACCREDITATION

Those programs that have external accreditation procedures are excused from duplicating information necessary for that external accreditation procedure in their program review process. Given that each accreditation procedure is unique, on a case-by-case basis certain of the elements identified in the Guidelines for Documents Prepared during the Program Review Process may simply be included as part of the accreditation documents submitted with their program review materials. This often includes such information on students, faculty, resources and enrollments compiled by the office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA) and that forms the basis of the annual academic scans, reflection on program assessment of student learning outcomes, and strategic planning for the future. Consequently, program faculty of such externally accredited programs should include their accreditation documents and only those elements NOT encompassed by those accreditation documents as their program review documents.

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE June 21, 2010
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT July 28, 2010
As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) must actively plan for the future. A program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The required elements of a program review are evidence-based self-examination, assessment of student learning outcomes, evaluation of resources necessary to ensure quality, and alignment of a program’s vision and mission with those of the university. The program review process is a meaningful way to assess and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of an academic program and allows the members of the program to document successes, needs, and goals for maintaining and/or improving their academic offerings. It involves a program’s commitment and willingness to candidly evaluate goals, objectives, and activities through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and to use program review results to improve curricular and budgetary decision-making process.

The program review process is primarily a faculty-driven process. Transparency and accountability are enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with resource allocation through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). Consequently, program review is a faculty-led peer review process by which evidence-based claims and decision-making can be used for planning and budgeting. The program review establishes intermediate benchmarks and follow-up plans that track program progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic and university-wide academic goals and objectives.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review aims to maintain and strengthen the quality of the university’s curriculum and its ability to meet the challenges of the future. Program review should be centered on the commitment to providing quality programs balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities, interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must determine whether students are accomplishing the program’s learning objectives through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development. In this way, the results of program review provide the evidentiary basis for informed, transparent and accountable decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through this faculty-driven program review process, the university administration, working collaboratively with the faculty at multiple steps in the process, is better prepared to allocate available resources and to plan for change.
To achieve these purposes, faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, and to use annual assessment findings for continuous program improvement. Such assessment demands that well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, and provide feedback for improvement. Program faculty are to prepare a retrospective Self-Study and a forward-looking Program Plan in advance of the next cycle of review. At the end of the process, the campus will systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, through negotiation of formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE

Each program conducting a review shall select a Self-Study Committee of at least three faculty members. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee is responsible for the preparation of a Self-Study and a Program Plan document. The committee receives access to the review guidelines and deadlines, a list of model self-studies, and other material. The chair of the department or interdisciplinary program is responsible for ensuring the timely and thoughtful completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document shall state that by a majority vote the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the Program Plan document and include the date on which the approval was made. If students and/or staff are involved in the self-study preparation process, their involvement should be limited to data collection, development of figures, etc. The writing, analysis, and recommendations must be completed by faculty.

EXTERNAL REVIEW

Programs that are not accredited by external bodies shall have an external review performed as part of the program review process. The program, in consultation with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs (AVPAA) and the school dean, proposes an external reviewer who does not have any conflicts of interest and has the experience to provide an effective review. The external reviewer must be approved by the University Program Review Committee (UPRC). The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) maintains a fund to pay for the external reviewer.

The purpose for the external review is to assist faculty in improving program quality by providing a new and comparative perspective on the program, a reflection on the last seven years of operation, and plans for the next seven years. The external reviewer will conduct an exit interview with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee), the appropriate school dean, the AVPAA (or designee), and the Provost. Within two weeks of the completion of the visit, the external reviewer will provide a draft of the external report to the program faculty and the Office of Academic Programs that provides comments and recommendations regarding the program. The program faculty has up to two weeks to submit any corrections of factual inaccuracies and misunderstandings. The external reviewer shall submit the final report (within a reasonable time period) for factual inaccuracies and evidence concerning the impact of these changes.
Office of Academic Programs to become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the appropriate school dean, the UPRC, and the Provost.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW

School deans oversee assessment processes, management of resources and strategic planning activities. Thus, it is imperative that they review and respond to the self-study, program plan, and related documents. The school dean shall add another review within two weeks of receiving the external reviewer’s report reflecting upon the comments and recommendations of the external reviewer. In the case of interschool programs, all relevant deans shall add their comments and recommendations.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW

Upon receiving the documents written by the Program Self-Study Committee, the external reviewer(s), and the school dean, the UPRC engages in a review of the program. The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools, two at-large faculty, one faculty appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and a non-voting member, the AVPAA or designee (ex officio). To ensure continuity in UPRC operation, the members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each member is given three WTUs of assigned time for his/her two-year service.

The UPRC will examine all documents submitted during the review and prepare its comments and recommendations. These are forwarded to the Office of Academic Programs. The UPRC shall also monitor the overall program review process, recommend changes in the program review policy and procedures, and ensure that program review findings are incorporated into university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year, the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed that year.

PROVOST REVIEW

Within a month after examining the program review documents, the Provost shall meet with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee) and school dean(s) to discuss the program review and all recommendations. Within a month of the meeting, the Provost, through active negotiation with the program faculty and appropriate school dean, shall prepare a MOUAP that identifies the agreed-upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support those recommendations, during the next seven years. The MOUAP will be signed by the department chair or program director, the school dean, and the Provost, kept on file in the department, the school, and the Office of Academic Affairs, and remain in effect for the duration of the review cycle. The program faculty and the school dean shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations.

ANNUAL REPORTS

ANNUAL REPORTS...
The annual report is an important component of the program review process that provides an opportunity for the program faculty to reflect upon and document their continuous improvement efforts. The content of the annual report includes updates on the progress made toward accomplishing the actions stated in the MOUAP and relevant changes since the last program review and/or annual report in response to emerging student needs, resource pressures, and data points. Annual reports are normally due on October 1 of each academic year and are submitted to the school dean and the UPRC for review.

The office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) prepares data annually for each program, including the number of students, faculty, degrees granted, and instructional cost. The program faculty shall update additional tables indicating the work that has been done over the last year on assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty activity, and funding plans, and prepare a narrative clarifying and explaining the data and discussing any emerging trends. If the program has a MOUAP, the program faculty shall evaluate the extent to which the program goals or benchmarks have been met and report the status of agreed-upon resource allocations. The cumulative data and narratives will provide the foundation for the next program review.

REPOSITORY AND REPORTING

Copies of all annual report and program review documents shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs. At the end of the academic year, the AVPAA shall prepare a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed that year.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

All degree-granting programs at CSUB undergo periodic academic program review. Programs that are externally accredited may conduct a modified program review, in which they meet the requirements for campus program review in an alternate fashion. In the year following the external accreditation, accredited programs will submit to the UPRC their accreditation documents, which include the accreditation self-study reports, letters and correspondence from the accrediting body, review team reports, responses to accreditation correspondence, accreditation action/decision letter, and other relevant material. In addition, programs should indicate to the UPRC where the required information for campus program review is located in the accreditation reports. For any items of the program review that are not addressed in the external accreditation reports, programs will need to provide the information in a separate response and submit it to the UPRC. Additionally, the school dean must submit a review if not involved in the accreditation process. Once these documents are received, the UPRC will review the material and produce a report, followed by the Provost review that culminates in a MOUAP.

MID-CYCLE REPORTS

Deleted: documents from each
Deleted: shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate office. Copies of the concluding Memorandum of Understanding Action Plan (MOUAP).
Deleted: and
Deleted: appropriate
Deleted: will be sent to the Academic Senate, the appropriate school dean, the chair of
Moved (insertion) [2]
Deleted: and
Deleted: chair of
Deleted: Program Self-Study Committee. Finally, at

Deleted: AVPAP
Deleted: circulate

Deleted: REVIEW FOR
Deleted: Those programs that have external accreditation procedures are excused from duplicating information necessary for that external accreditation procedure in their program review process. Given that each accreditation procedure is unique, on a case-by-case basis certain of the elements identified in the Guidelines for Documents Prepared during the Program Review Process may simply be included as part of the accreditation documents submitted with their program review materials. This often includes such information on students, faculty, resources and enrollments compiled by the office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA) and that forms the basis of the annual academic scans, reflection on program assessment of student learning outcomes, and strategic planning for the future. Consequently, program faculty of such externally accredited programs should include their accreditation documents and only those elements NOT encompassed by those accreditation documents as their program review documents.
In some cases, the UPRC may request that a program submit a mid-cycle report to provide an update on any specific recommendations made in the last program review. Mid-cycle reports are typically submitted to the UPRC in the third year after completion of the program review.

**PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW EXTENSIONS**

Under extenuating circumstances, a program may request a one-semester extension of its program review. The request must include a justification for the extension, and an acknowledgement of the school dean. Upon receiving the request, the UPRC will discuss and vote on it, and the UPRC Chair will notify the program if the request is approved.

When programs have not submitted a self-study after one year of their initial deadline, the UPRC shall meet with the Provost, the program director or department chair, and appropriate school dean(s) to decide how to proceed. An additional extension may be granted if appropriate, or the UPRC may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURES

California State University, Bakersfield
Fall 2020

As a university dedicated to meeting the needs of its region and to providing leadership and expertise for students and the community, California State University, Bakersfield (CSUB) must actively plan for the future. A program review is an essential component of the active planning process. The required elements of a program review are evidence-based self-examination, assessment of student learning outcomes, evaluation of resources necessary to ensure quality, and alignment of a program’s vision and mission with those of the university. The program review process is a meaningful way to assess and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of an academic program and allows the members of the program to document successes, needs, and goals for maintaining and/or improving their academic offerings. It involves a program’s commitment and willingness to candidly evaluate goals, objectives, and activities through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and to use program review results to improve curricular and budgetary decision-making process.

The program review process is primarily a faculty-driven process. Transparency and accountability are enhanced by tying together the recommendations for program improvement with resource allocation through a Memorandum of Understanding and Action Plan (MOUAP). Consequently, program review is a faculty-led peer review process by which evidence-based claims and decision-making can be used for planning and budgeting. The program review establishes intermediate benchmarks and follow-up plans that track program progress toward achieving and ensuring alignment of student, programmatic and university-wide academic goals and objectives.

PURPOSES OF PROGRAM REVIEW

Program review aims to maintain and strengthen the quality of the university's curriculum and its ability to meet the challenges of the future. Program review should be centered on the commitment to providing quality programs balanced with respect for the needs of society in general and the region in particular, student abilities, interests, and career needs. Most importantly, program review must determine whether students are accomplishing the program’s learning objectives through outcomes-based assessment of student learning and development. In this way, the results of program review provide the evidentiary basis for informed, transparent and accountable decisions about program, faculty and student needs, curricular planning, and resource allocation and management. Through this faculty-driven program review process, the university administration, working collaboratively with the faculty at multiple steps in the process, is better prepared to allocate available resources and to plan for change.
To achieve these purposes, faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, and to use annual assessment findings for continuous program improvement. Such assessment demands that well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, and provide feedback for improvement. Program faculty are to prepare a retrospective Self-Study and a forward-looking Program Plan in advance of the next cycle of review. At the end of the process, the campus will systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, through negotiation of formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.

ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE FOR THE REVIEW PROCESS

PROGRAM SELF-STUDY COMMITTEE

Each program conducting a review shall select a Self-Study Committee of at least three faculty members. In consultation with program faculty and representative students, the committee is responsible for the preparation of a Self-Study and a Program Plan document. The committee receives access to the review guidelines and deadlines, a list of model self-studies, and other material. The chair of the department or interdisciplinary program is responsible for ensuring the timely and thoughtful completion of the program review. The title page of the program review document shall state that by a majority vote the program faculty has approved the Self-Study and the Program Plan document and include the date on which the approval was made. If students and/or staff are involved in the self-study preparation process, their involvement should be limited to data collection, development of figures, etc. The writing, analysis, and recommendations must be completed by faculty.

EXTERNAL REVIEW

Programs that are not accredited by external bodies shall have an external review performed as part of the program review process. The program, in consultation with the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Academic Programs (AVPAA) and the school dean, proposes an external reviewer who does not have any conflicts of interest and has the experience to provide an effective review. The external reviewer must be approved by the UPRC. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (Provost) maintains a fund to pay for the external reviewer.

The purpose for the external review is to assist faculty in improving program quality by providing a new and comparative perspective on the program, a reflection on the last seven years of operation, and plans for the next seven years. The external reviewer will conduct an exit interview with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee), the appropriate school dean, the AVPAA (or designee), and the Provost. Within two weeks of the completion of the visit, the external reviewer will provide a draft of the external report to the program faculty and the Office of Academic Programs that provides comments and recommendations regarding the program. The program faculty has up to two weeks to submit any corrections of factual inaccuracies and misunderstandings. The external reviewer shall submit the final report to the
Office of Academic Programs to become part of the package of documents subsequently reviewed by the appropriate school dean, the UPRC, and the Provost.

SCHOOL DEAN REVIEW

School deans oversee assessment processes, management of resources and strategic planning activities. Thus, it is imperative that they review and respond to the self-study, program plan, and related documents. The school dean shall add another review within two weeks of receiving the external reviewer’s report reflecting upon the comments and recommendations of the external reviewer. In the case of interschool programs, all relevant deans shall add their comments and recommendations.

UNIVERSITY REVIEW

Upon receiving the documents written by the Program Self-Study Committee, the external reviewer(s), and the school dean, the UPRC engages in a review of the program. The UPRC consists of one faculty member elected by each of the schools, two at-large faculty, one faculty appointed by the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and a non-voting member, the AVPAA or designee (ex officio). To ensure continuity in UPRC operation, the members shall serve two-year staggered terms. Each member is given three WTUs of assigned time for his/her two-year service.

The UPRC will examine all documents submitted during the review and prepare its comments and recommendations. These are forwarded to the Office of Academic Programs. The UPRC shall also monitor the overall program review process, recommend changes in the program review policy and procedures, and ensure that program review findings are incorporated into university-wide curricular and budgetary planning processes. Finally, at the end of the academic year, the chair of the UPRC shall submit to the Academic Senate a summary of the major findings and recommendations for all programs reviewed that year.

PROVOST REVIEW

Within a month after examining the program review documents, the Provost shall meet with the program faculty, the chair of the UPRC (or designee) and school dean(s) to discuss the program review and all recommendations. Within a month of the meeting, the Provost, through active negotiation with the program faculty and appropriate school dean, shall prepare a MOUAP that identifies the agreed-upon recommendations to be implemented, as well as the resources that will be provided to support those recommendations, during the next seven years. The MOUAP will be signed by the department chair or program director, the school dean, and the Provost, kept on file in the department, the school, and the Office of Academic Affairs, and remain in effect for the duration of the review cycle. The program faculty and the school dean shall be responsible for implementing the recommendations.

ANNUAL REPORTS
The annual report is an important component of the program review process that provides an opportunity for the program faculty to reflect upon and document their continuous improvement efforts. The content of the annual report includes updates on the progress made toward accomplishing the actions stated in the MOUAP and relevant changes since the last program review and/or annual report in response to emerging student needs, resource pressures, and data points. Annual reports are normally due on October 1 of each academic year and are submitted to the school dean and the UPRC for review.

The office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (IRPA) prepares data annually for each program, including the number of students, faculty, degrees granted, and instructional cost. The program faculty shall update additional tables indicating the work that has been done over the last year on assessment of student learning outcomes, faculty activity, and funding plans, and prepare a narrative clarifying and explaining the data and discussing any emerging trends. If the program has a MOUAP, the program faculty shall evaluate the extent to which the program goals or benchmarks have been met and report the status of agreed-upon resource allocations. The cumulative data and narratives will provide the foundation for the next program review.

REPOSITORY AND REPORTING

Copies of all annual report and program review documents shall be maintained in the office of Academic Affairs. At the end of the academic year, the AVPAA shall prepare a summary of the major findings, recommendations and budgetary allotments for all programs reviewed that year.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAMS WITH EXTERNAL ACCREDITATION

All degree-granting programs at CSUB undergo periodic academic program review. Programs that are externally accredited may conduct a modified program review, in which they meet the requirements for campus program review in an alternate fashion. In the year following the external accreditation, accredited programs will submit to the UPRC their accreditation documents, which include the accreditation self-study reports, letters and correspondence from the accrediting body, review team reports, responses to accreditation correspondence, accreditation action/decision letter, and other relevant material. In addition, programs should indicate to the UPRC where the required information for campus program review is located in the accreditation reports. For any items of the program review that are not addressed in the external accreditation reports, programs will need to provide the information in a separate response and submit it to the UPRC. Additionally, the school dean must submit a review if not involved in the accreditation process. Once these documents are received, the UPRC will review the material and produce a report, followed by the Provost review that culminates in a MOUAP.

MID-CYCLE REPORTS
In some cases, the UPRC may request that a program submit a mid-cycle report to provide an update on any specific recommendations made in the last program review. Mid-cycle reports are typically submitted to the UPRC in the third year after completion of the program review.

PROCEDURES FOR PROGRAM REVIEW EXTENSIONS

Under extenuating circumstances, a program may request a one-semester extension of its program review. The request must include a justification for the extension, and an acknowledgement of the school dean. Upon receiving the request, the UPRC will discuss and vote on it, and the UPRC Chair will notify the program if the request is approved.

When programs have not submitted a self-study after one year of their initial deadline, the UPRC shall meet with the Provost, the program director or department chair, and appropriate school dean(s) to decide how to proceed. An additional extension may be granted if appropriate, or the UPRC may elect to proceed with the program review without a self-study prepared by the program.
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Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Elements of the Self-Study</strong></td>
<td>Program faculty may be required to provide a list of program-level student learning outcomes.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes and summarize annual assessment findings.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to provide the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment studies, findings, and resulting changes. They may be required to submit a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
<td>Faculty are required to evaluate the program’s student learning outcomes, annual assessment findings, benchmarking results, subsequent changes, and evidence concerning the impact of these changes. They present a plan for the next cycle of assessment studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process of Review</strong></td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers do not address evidence concerning the quality of student learning in the program other than grades.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers address indirect and possibly direct evidence of student learning in the program; they do so at the descriptive level, rather than providing an evaluation.</td>
<td>Internal and external reviewers analyze direct and indirect evidence of student learning in the program and offer evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. They have sufficient expertise to evaluate program efforts. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>Well-qualified internal and external reviewers evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. They give evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement. The department uses the feedback to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Budgeting</strong></td>
<td>The campus has not integrated program reviews into planning and budgeting processes.</td>
<td>The campus has attempted to integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but with limited success.</td>
<td>The campus generally integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, but not through a formal process.</td>
<td>The campus systematically integrates program reviews into planning and budgeting processes, e.g., through negotiating formal action plans with mutually agreed-upon commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</strong></td>
<td>No individual or committee on campus provides feedback to departments on the quality of their outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, impact, etc.</td>
<td>An individual or committee occasionally provides feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, etc. Departments use the feedback to improve their work.</td>
<td>A well-qualified individual or committee provides annual feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact. Departments effectively use the feedback to improve student learning. Follow-up activities enjoy institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Student Experience</strong></td>
<td>Students are unaware of and uninvolved in program review.</td>
<td>Program review may include focus groups or conversations with students to follow up on results of surveys</td>
<td>The internal and external reviewers examine samples of student work, e.g., sample papers, portfolios, and capstone projects. Students may be invited to discuss what they learned and how they learned it.</td>
<td>Students are respected partners in the program review process. They may offer poster sessions on their work, demonstrate how they apply rubrics to self-assess, and/or provide their own evaluative feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guidelines for Using the Program Review Rubric

For the fullest picture of an institution’s accomplishments, reviews of written materials should be augmented with interviews at the time of the visit.

Dimensions of the Rubric:

1. Self-Study Requirements. The campus should have explicit requirements for the program’s self-study, including an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes and a review of the annual assessment studies conducted since the last program review. Faculty preparing the self-study can reflect on the accumulating results and their impact, and plan for the next cycle of assessment studies. As much as possible, programs can benchmark findings against similar programs on other campuses.

   Questions: Does the campus require self-studies that include an analysis of the program’s learning outcomes, assessment studies, assessment results, benchmarking results, and assessment impact, including the impact of changes made in response to earlier studies? Does the campus require an updated assessment plan for the subsequent years before the next program review?

2. Self-Study Review. Internal reviewers (on-campus individuals) and external reviewers (off-campus individuals, usually disciplinary experts) evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact; and they provide evaluative feedback and suggestions for improvement.

   Questions: Who reviews the self-studies? Do they have the training or expertise to provide effective feedback? Do they routinely evaluate the program’s learning outcomes, assessment plan, assessment evidence, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do they provide suggestions for improvement? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

3. Planning and Budgeting. Program reviews are not be pro forma exercises; they should be tied to planning and budgeting processes, with expectations that increased support will lead to increased effectiveness, such as improving student learning and retention rates.

   Questions: Does the campus systematically integrate program reviews into planning and budgeting processes? Are expectations established for the impact of planned changes?

4. Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts. Institutions often find considerable variation in the quality of assessment efforts across programs. While program reviews encourage departments to reflect on multi-year assessment results, some programs are likely to require more immediate feedback, usually based on a required annual assessment report. This feedback might be provided by an assessment director or committee, relevant dean or others; and whoever has this responsibility should have the expertise to provide quality feedback.

   Questions: Does someone or a committee have the responsibility for providing annual feedback on the assessment process? Does this person or team have the expertise to provide effective feedback? Does this person or team routinely provide feedback on the quality of outcomes, assessment plans, assessment studies, benchmarking results, and assessment impact? Do departments effectively use this feedback to improve student learning?

5. The Student Experience. Students have a unique perspective on a given program of study; they know better than anyone what it means to go through it as a student. Program review can take advantage of that perspective and build it into the review.

   Questions: Are students aware of the purpose and value of program review? Are they involved in preparations and the self-study? Do they have an opportunity to interact with internal or external reviewers, demonstrate and interpret their learning, and provide evaluative feedback?
Appendix 1: Suggested Changes to CSUB Program Review Documents

1. “Program Review Policy & Procedures (Spring 2010):”
   - Annual Report: Is it current?
     - Narrative not exceeding 2 pages
   - External Review:
     - Who attends the external reviewer exit meeting?
   - Role of deans: “may add another review”
   - UPRC
     - UPRC member reassigned time: 5 WTUs
     - Include UPRC Charge?
   - Provost: Who prepares MOUAP?
   - Repository of program review documents: both Academic Programs and Senate?

2. “Program Review Template (updated 5/22/2019)”
   - Number of copies submitted: electronic + 3 + 10 (p.1 and p.2)
   - Dean: “has option” to provide comments (p.1)
   - Dean and faculty develop a draft MOUAP.

3. “Academic Program Annual Reports”
   - Is this the current version?
   - The new narrative not exceeding 2 pages
   - Template for annual report to be updated?
   - Appendix IV (p.11): for program assessment, still use Quarter

4. “Preparing a Winning Self-Study” (UPRC Workshop in Fall 2019)
   - Number of copies submitted: electronic + 7 complete hard copies (p.6)
Appendix 2: UPRC Folders in Box and SharePoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Folder</th>
<th>Box</th>
<th>SharePoint in OneDrive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Annual Report to Senate | - 2010-2011 to 2019-2020  
- No 2013-2014  
- No 2015-2016 | - 2010-2011 to 2018-2019  
- No 2013-2014  
- No 2015-2016  
- No 2019-2020  
| Archives | a. Additional documents-2016-17  
- UPRC Charge  
- UPRC concerns: see Draft 2 | Archives (No folder) |
|  | b. Agenda-Minutes 2010-2018  
Agendas:  
- Agendas for 2012-13: in the folders of 2011-12 and 2013-14 agenda folders; also available in UPRC → Archives → Program Reviews → 2012 13 Program Reviews → 2012 13 Agenda’s  
- 2015-16 Agendas: incomplete  
- No separate folder for 2016-2017 agendas: 2016-2017 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2016-2017”  
- No separate folder for 2018-19 agendas; 2018-19 agendas are in the folder of “Minutes 2018-2019”  
Minutes:  
- Incomplete minutes: 2011-2012, 2015-2016,  
- No minutes for 2012-13  
- 2018-19 minutes for Spring 2019 semester are in “UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020 folder” | |
|  | c. Completed reviews  
- Arts 2010-2011 Review  
- Computer Science Review 2010-11  
- PEAK  
- PPA 2010-2011 Review  
Information in this folder is duplicate, which is available in UPRC → Reviews by Program. | |
|  | d. Correspondence | |
|  | e. External reviewer information | |
|  | f. General UPRC letterhead | |
|  | g. Memos’s | |
|  | h. MOUAP Archives  
- MOUAP template  
- Signed MOUAPs | |
|  | i. Procedures | |
|  | j. Program Review Process | |
|  | k. Program Review Templates 2016-17 | |
|  | l. Program Reviews  
- Program Reviews by year (2009-10 – 2017-18) | |
• Duplicate; files are also available in UPRC →Reviews by Program
• 2014 15 Program Reviews folder – MSA Administration (online): includes two different files from those in Reviews by Program - _Administration 2015 16 [suggestion: Include two files in the Reviews by Program folder]
• 2016 17 Program Reviews folder – MA Educational Administration: suggestion: include a folder on MAEA in Reviews by Program folder under “Education MA”
• 2016 17 Program Reviews folder:
  o also includes 2016-17 meeting agendas and minutes (9/28/2016 – 5/8/2017)
  o also includes UPRC Workshop 2-10-17 (including agenda, PPT, eval forms)
• 2017 18 Program Reviews folder:
  o Also includes 2017 18 Meetings (Agendas: 10/2/2017 – 5/7/2018; Minutes: 9/25/2017 – 5/14/2018)

m. Program scans
n. Thank you letters
o. Trend analysis
p. UPRC Committee
q. UPRC Grid
r. UPRC letterhead Contains same information as in General UPRC Letterhead folder (see f)
s. UPRC Previous committee members
  • contains same but less information as in UPRC Committee (see p)
t. WASC
u. Welcome letters
v. Welcome letters(1)
  • contains same but less information as in Welcome Letters.

| Mid-Cycle Report | Folder called “Mid-Cycle Report 8-21-19”
2 files, same document, one in Word, one in PDF | 1 file in PDF |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOUAP Template</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 file in Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUAP</td>
<td>No separate folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Signed MOUAPs are in UPRC →Archives →MOUAP Archives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program Review   | - Program Review Progress Report: 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF
| Procedures and Templates | - The rest are same. | - No Program Review Progress Report
<p>|                  | 1 file in PDF                                     | No folder |
| Program Review   | No Folder                                         | 1 file: Program_Review_Taskforce_ Notes_04_18_2017 |
| Progress Report  |                                                  |           |
| Program Review   | 2 files, same, one in Word, one in PDF            | No folder |
| Taskforce        |                                                  |           |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template with Timeline</th>
<th>2 files: MOUAP Template (2011-12 to 2016-17) + Program_Review_Template 2 (1/17/2018)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Templates</td>
<td>No Folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews by Program</td>
<td>Individual program review listed separately in its own folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration: Mixed up</td>
<td>Administrator: No Folder. Folder of Administration in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12 Folder: This is for MS HCA.</td>
<td>This is for online MSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Folder: This is for online MSA.</td>
<td>There is a separate folder for MS-HCA – see below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include two files in this folder from UPRC → Archives → Program Reviews → 2014 15 Program Reviews → MSA Administration (online)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Studies</td>
<td>Applied Studies (No Folder) In Completed Reviews folder. No “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same PDF files + 1 PDF “BS in Applied Studies RES031”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
<td>BA and MA Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word File – “Notification”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Art</td>
<td>BA Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 33 more Word/Excel Files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
<td>BA CAFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word/Excel files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Communications</td>
<td>BA Communications Archives/Supporting Documents Folders are empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences</td>
<td>BA Human Biological Sciences In Completed Reviews folder, there is another folder called Human Biological Sciences. Files are included in BA Human Biological Sciences folder in BOX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
<td>BA Liberal Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Music</td>
<td>BA Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
<td>BA Political Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + more Word files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Psychology</td>
<td>BA Psychology (NO Folder) Not in Completed Reviews folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Religious Studies</td>
<td>BA Religious Studies Supporting Documents Folder is empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Sociology</td>
<td>BA Sociology Archives folder contains 2015-16 Social Work Folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word file; Archives folder contains 2015-16 Social Work Folder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
<td>BA Theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + 1 more Word and 1 more Excel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Status Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-BS-MS Geology</td>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word/Excel files; No Supporting Documents folder is empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MA English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Agricultural Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Chemistry &amp; Biochemistry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Computer Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Electrical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Engineering Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS ERM Environmental Resource Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Kinesiology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS_MS Nursing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS Counseling Psych</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA-MPA PPA</td>
<td>BA-MPA in Public Administration (No folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same PDF files + few more Word files including UPRC Notification 1/15/2015</td>
<td>1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BA-MPA in Public Administration (No folder):**
but 1 file re UPRC Notification 1/15/2015 is included in BA-MPA PPA.

**PPA:**
- Contains 3 PDF files (“NASPAA_Accred_2009,” “Provost_Memo_2003,” “UPRC PPA BAPA and MPA Program Reviews Memo2 2”) and 1 Word file “PPA Response to UPRC Program Review Report, October 20, 20”), which are not available in BA-MPA PPA Folder;
- The other two Word files are in BA-MPA PPA Folder.

**Public Admin:**
Contains 2 folders:
- 2018 External Report folder: includes 1 PDF file re UPRC Memo (5/14/2018) “UPRC Response BAPA MPA 2017 18,” which is not available in BA-MPA PPA Folder; the other three PDF files are in BA-MPA PPA Folder.
- Archives folder includes more prior reviews info (1998-99; 2010-11; etc.)

Combine all folders into 1 folder

**BS Natural Sciences:**
same PDF files + more Word/Excel files

**BS Physics:**
same + Physics 2015 Folder

**BS-MS Biology:**
same

**Business Admin:**
Same + More old files (1997-98, 2009-10 review cycle materials)
**Completed Reviews (No Separate Folder)**

There is a “Completed Reviews” folder in Archives (see above in Archives section).

**Email Attachments**

**Computer and Electrical Sciences (NO Folder)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Computer Engineering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>In the folder of Reviews by Program – BS Engineering Sciences Supporting Documents folder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Counseling MS:**

Contains 2 folders
- 2005-06 Folder: Excel file “Counseling MS data master”
- 2010-11 Folder:

**MS Counseling:**

Contains 2 files re extension approval

**EDCS**

Contains 2015-16 review folder + other files

Combine all folders into 1 folder

**Educational Counseling (No folder)**

Folder in Completed Reviews folder
Contains 2 files: “EDCS Self study-Fall 15” & “EDCS-PR Memo 2”

**Criminal Justice**

Same + More
No UPRC Draft Memo (2/6/2017) which is available in SharePoint called “CJ Review.”

**Computer and Electrical Sciences**

Folder contains 4 files:
- ABET Self study computer engineering-2017-18 self study report
- ABET Self study Electrical Engineering-2017-18 self study report
- Computer and electrical engineering final 11-16-2018Final2
- Engineering Sciences extension

**Criminal Justice (No folder)**

In Completed Reviews folder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU Accredited Programs by campus</td>
<td>Contains 1 Word file: CSU accredited programs by Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>EDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education MA</td>
<td>Contains 2010-11 Folder &amp; 1998-99 folder + other files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include a separate folder for MA Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine info from Box and SharePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Experience</td>
<td>Contains 2013-14 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Intelligence and National Security</td>
<td>Same + few more Word files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No UPRC Memo (11/20/2015), which is available in SharePoint “GINS Final.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Same + More (including info re prior reviews 1998-99, 2006-07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>MORE files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary MA</td>
<td>Same + few more files in 2003-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No UPRF draft memo, which is available in SharePoint “INSTDraft1”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Major-Inter Studies</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contains 1 Word File “InterStudies Review Notification,” which is available in Interdisciplinary MA Folder – Archives folder – Interdis 2014-15 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine folders into 1 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA Education C and I</td>
<td>More + MA Education folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Languages &amp; Literature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS-Health Care Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>Same + MORE (including info re prior reviews 1996-97, 2003-04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Same + 1 Word file “UPRCReviewNoteScienceEducation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Social Work (NO folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16 Social Work Folder is in BA Sociology folder in Archives Folder.</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder Has more files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine the 2015-16 Social Work folder in BOX and Social Work folder in SharePoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a separate folder in BOX with the above information included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PDF file + Special Education 2016 folder</td>
<td>no Special Education 2016 folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED</td>
<td>SPED (NO folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same 3 PDF files + 1 PDF file &quot;MOUAP SPECIAL ED 2016&quot;</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPED-Memo.2015: UPRC Memo (10/30/2015) not in Special Education folder, but in SPED folder in BOX and SharePoint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine folders into 1 folder; include the above two files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>Teacher Education (NO folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More</td>
<td>In Completed Reviews folder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But the following 2 are not in Box, which are available in SharePoint:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“S Schmidt MEMO dtd 11-16-16”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stacey letter 11-15-16”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 File: “Questions for Reflection 9_08_11 2”</td>
<td>1 File: “Questions for Reflection 9_08_11 2” (NOT in folder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Grid</td>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid” 3 folders:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder called “UPRC Grid 2019-2020” 2 Folders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2018-19: 10 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2019-20: 2 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Meeting Agenda-Minutes</td>
<td>Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,” 114 files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder called “Meeting Agenda-Minutes 2019-2020,” 114 files</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minutes: 1/31/2019-3/10/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agenda: 2/7/2019-3/3/2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRC Members</td>
<td>5 files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members and Term Limits</td>
<td>4 files; 2016-2017 UPRC membership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| UPRC Letterhead       | Folder called “UPRC Official-LH-6-4-19,” 1 Word File | Folder called “UPRC Letterhead,” including  
|                      |                                                    |  
|                      |                                                    | • 2016 Letterhead Folder (4 Word files) and  
|                      |                                                    | • 1 Word File for UPRC-Letterhead-6-4-19  
| UPRC Review Cycle 2019 | 2 files + 1 Outlook Item                          |  
| UPRC Workshops       | • UPRC Workshop 2017: 20 items                   |  
|                      | • UPRC Workshop 2018: 21 items                   |  
|                      | • UPRC Workshop Fall 2019: 10 items             |  
|                      | • UPRC Workshop Spring 2019: 1 item             |  
|                      | • Thumbs                                          |  
| Important Communications | NO folder                                      |  
| Other                | • Two files: .DS Store and Thumbs                |  
|                      | Other files:                                     |  
|                      | • English letter revised_updated_02_12_2018      |  
|                      | • O365 Groups – QRG                              |  
|                      | • Preparing a winning self-study1                |  
|                      | • Program review roster                          |  
|                      | • UPRC Workshops Feb 2018                        |  

### Appendix 3: Issues of Concern in Academic Program Review at CSUB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPRC Recommendations/Issues of Concern</th>
<th>AY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Program Review Template and MOUAP Template need to be reviewed and reaffirmed by the Academic Senate.*</td>
<td>2019-2020; 2018-2019; 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of assessing student learning outcomes*</td>
<td>2019-2020; 2018-2019; 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the information on undergraduate and graduate programs separately and clearly in the self-studies*</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring programs have sufficient notice for preparing their Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to program sustainability*</td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning External Reviewer visits in advance*</td>
<td>2017-2018; 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving accredited programs in the university program review process</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of UPRC</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Annual Report process</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of deans</td>
<td>2016-2017; 2011-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising program review template</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of program and department</td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. The list of issues of concern in academic program review at CSUB was compiled based on archived UPRC reports (AY 2010-2011 – AY 2019-2020); UPRC reports for AY 2013-2014 and AY 2015-2016 are not available.
2. Recommendations marked with an asteroid were identified by the UPRC in their poster presentation with the WSCUC Team.
Appendix 4: Academic Program Review at CSUs – Information on the Website

Bakersfield
1. [https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Program%20Review/index.html](https://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Program%20Review/index.html)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Academic Program Review Policy and Procedures (Spring 2010)
   c. Academic Program Annual Reports
   d. Program Review Progress Report
   e. University Program Review Schedule
   f. University Program Review Committee

Channel Islands
1. [https://www.csuci.edu/continuousimprovement/program-review.htm](https://www.csuci.edu/continuousimprovement/program-review.htm)
2. 5-year cycle
3. Available on the website:
   a. Program Review Process
   b. Program Review Schedule
   c. Program Review Guidelines

Chico
1. [https://www.csuchico.edu/apr/](https://www.csuchico.edu/apr/)
2. [https://www.csuchico.edu/graduatestudies/about-us/academic-program-review.shtml](https://www.csuchico.edu/graduatestudies/about-us/academic-program-review.shtml)
3. Once every 5 years
4. Separate undergraduate and graduate program reviews
5. Available on the website:
   a. Undergraduate programs
      i. Undergrad Academic Program Review Guidelines
      ii. Undergrad External Review Process and Guide
      iii. APR Funding
      iv. Undergrad Program Review Schedule
   b. Graduate programs
      i. Graduate Academic Program Review Guidelines
      ii. Graduate External Review Process and Guide
      iii. APR Funding
      iv. Graduate Program Review Schedule
6. Required program data elements for program review (Undergraduate):

Dominguez Hills
1. [https://www.csudh.edu/uepa/program-review/](https://www.csudh.edu/uepa/program-review/)
2. Every 6 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Goals of academic program review
b. Program Review Schedule
   c. Program Review Guide
   d. Program Review Panel Charge
   e. Program Review Panel Roster
   f. Program Review Panel Meeting Minutes (2016-17)
   g. Past Program Review Summary Agreements

East Bay
1. https://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/five-year-review.html
3. Every 5 years
4. Available on the website:
   a. Academic Program Review Procedures
   b. Annual Report deadlines
   c. Annual Report Template & Checklist
   d. External Reviewer Request Form
   e. 19-20 Five-Year Program Review Schedule
   f. Five-year Program Review Archives by Department (including 5-year reviews, CAPR Review Documents, and MOUs)
   g. Committee on Academic Planning and Review (CAPR) Committee Information:
      Committee Policies & Procedures
   h. Subcommittees of CAPR
   i. 2020-21 CAPR Members
   j. CAPR Meeting Archive (including meeting agendas and minutes from 1999-2020)
5. Academic Program Review Procedures:
   https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAybb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view
6. CAPR Committee Policies & Procedures (CAPR Charge):
   https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kjb8g0askhM4m_QLc9CUMlji_PTLXND-DeU/edit

Fresno
1. University Committee Review: https://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/curriculum/prog-review/
   Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:
   http://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/senate/committees/curriculum/index.html
   University Graduate Committee:
   http://www.fresnostate.edu/academics/senate/committees/graduate/index.html
2. 5-year cycle
3. Available on the website:
   a. Procedures & Guidelines for Review of Academic Programs
   b. Abbreviated Program Review for Nationally Accredited Programs
   c. Forms and Templates (Orientation, Self-Study Template, Review Team Report, & Action Plan)
   d. Academic Program Review Schedule (by college)
4. Data in Undergraduate Program Review Packet (Fall 2013):
5. Data in Graduate Program Review Packet (Fall 2019):
**Fullerton**
1. [http://www.fullerton.edu/data/quality/ppr/](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/quality/ppr/)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. University Policy Statement on Program Performance Review (PPR)
   b. PPR Guidelines
   c. PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Year and by Program
   d. PPR Reports by College (Programs)
4. [PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Year](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_Y_050820.pdf)
5. [PPR Schedule 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Program](http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppr/PPR_Schedule_P_050820.pdf)

**Humboldt**
1. [https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/program-review-documents](https://academicprograms.humboldt.edu/content/program-review-documents) (need password to log in to view program review documents.)
   [https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment)
   [https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments) (This website is currently under construction. A new Assessment and Program Review website will be up in Summer 2020.)
2. 6-year cycle
3. Available on the website ([https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment](https://ie.humboldt.edu/Assessments/AcademicAssessment)):
   a. Program Review Schedule by Year and by Program
   b. Timeline of Review Year
   c. Self-Study Template
   d. External Review: Logistics and Template

**Long Beach**
1. [https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc](https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website:
   a. Charge of the Program Assessment and Review Council (PARC), membership, committees, subcommittees
   b. Committee meeting schedule
   c. Links to documents
   f. Council Duties
   g. Assessments
4. **Academic Senate Policy on Program Review:**

Los Angeles

1. [http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review](http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review)
2. Every 6 years
3. Available on the website
   a. Policy on program review
   b. Program review schedule (by college/program)
   c. Program review subcommittee (current members)
   d. Program review resources: [http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources](http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources)
      i. Templates
         1. Program Review Self-study Template
         3. Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (for externally accredited programs)
         4. Comprehensive Assessment Plan Template
      ii. Program Review Workshop Materials
         1. Program Review Workshop I: Orientation for Self-study process
         2. Program Review Workshop: Modified Self Study
         3. Program Review Workshop: Data Pull
         4. Program Review Workshop III: Meaningful Assessment

Maritime Academy

2. Curriculum Committee of Academic Senate: [https://www.csum.edu/web/academic-senate-community/curation-committee/index.html](https://www.csum.edu/web/academic-senate-community/curation-committee/index.html)
   a. Curriculum Committee Policies & Procedures regarding academic program review: [https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=db84e12b-fa04-4c14-a2de-d28d2d7f8b7b&groupId=3965808.html.pdf](https://www.csum.edu/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=db84e12b-fa04-4c14-a2de-d28d2d7f8b7b&groupId=3965808.html.pdf)
3. Every 5-6 years
4. Available on the website
   a. Annual Learning Results (by program)
   b. Program Review (by programs)

Monterey Bay

1. [https://csumb.edu/academicaffairs/program-review-0](https://csumb.edu/academicaffairs/program-review-0)
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Overview of Academic Program Review
   c. Academic Program Review Schedule (by college/program)
   d. Program Review Process
Northridge
1. https://www.csun.edu/assessment-and-program-review/program-review
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Overview of Academic Program Review (including purpose and flowchart of program review process)
   b. Programs currently in program review process
   c. Quick links to MOU Scholar Works Collection
   d. Quick links to AAPR A to Z (program review procedures & policy, self-study guidelines, guidelines for external review).

Pomona
2. Every 5 years
3. Available on the website
   a. Program review schedule by year/college
   b. Program review process and responsible parties
   c. Program review resources: Department, external review, dean, sample data, and WASC resources

Sacramento
1. https://www.csus.edu/academic-affairs/academic-excellence/
2. 6-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Academic Program Review Policy
   b. Program review process and responsible parties:
   c. University Program Review Manual

San Bernardino
1. https://www.csusb.edu/academic-programs/program-review/program-review-resources
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. Program Review policy
   b. Academic Master Plan 2020-21 through 2029-30
   c. Program Review Report Templates (Dean’s report template, external review report template, University Program Review Committee Report template, Department action plan template)

San Diego
1. https://assessment.sdsu.edu/
2. 5-7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. No information about academic program review
b. Information about program assessment (Student Learning Outcomes Committee, Program Assessment Rubric, Program Assessment Primer, etc.)

San Francisco
1. [https://ueap.sfsu.edu/content/acaplan/program_review/home](https://ueap.sfsu.edu/content/acaplan/program_review/home)
2. Currently in 7th cycle. A cycle of program review is complete when all colleges have undergone review.
3. Available on the website
   a. Handbook and Guidelines for the Seventh Cycle of Academic Program Review
   b. Seventh Cycle
      i. Cohort 4 (2019-2020, 8 programs)
      ii. Cohort 3 (2018-2019, 7 programs)
      iii. Completed 7th Cycle Program Review: including links to each program’s self study, external review, response to external review, Concluding Action Memo
         1. Cohort 2 (2017-2018, 10 programs)
         2. Cohort 1 (2016-2017, 7 programs)
   c. Academic Program Review Resources
      i. Seventh cycle academic program review process
      ii. Overview of high impact practices files
      iii. Table templates
4. [Academic Program Review Process](https://ueap.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/program_review/7th_cycle_process_%281%29.pdf)

San Jose
1. [https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html)
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. University Policy on Program Planning
   b. Planning process (each step, program planning guidelines and templates, program planning checklist)
   c. Support resources for process (program planning release time request, submission and communications, extension requests)
   d. Other useful resources (links to Program Assessment webpage, Program Records webpage, WASC rubrics, University Learning Goals, Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (IEA) website, list of High Impact practices, Program Planning workshop, Guidelines for Concentrations)
4. [Program Planning template for accredited programs](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html)
5. [Program Planning Extension Requests](https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf)

San Luis Obispo
1. [https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/program-review](https://academicprograms.calpoly.edu/content/program-review)
2. 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Academic program review process (self-review and peer-review)
b. Documents and templates (templates for undergraduate and graduate self-study, reviewer nomination form, sample site visit itinerary, action plan template, program review checklist)

San Marcos
2. 5- or 7-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Schedule of program reviews
   b. Program review policy and guidelines
   c. Process flow chart
   d. Process timeline
   e. External reviewers guide
   f. Support documents for program review (program data notebook, self-study report template, link to Institutional Planning & Analytics)

Sonoma
1. https://academicaffairs.sonoma.edu/academic-programs/program-review
2. 5-year cycle
3. Available on the website
   a. Program Review Workshop Spring 2020
   b. Program Review Timeline
   c. Program Review Policy
   d. Self-study process guidelines
   e. External review
   f. Next steps: University Program Review Subcommittee
   g. Program review schedule (including links to some programs’ self-study and external review)

Stanislaus
1. https://www.csustan.edu/office-assessment/academic-program-review
2. Every 7 years
3. Available on the website
   a. APR Procedures, Schedule, and Timeline (links to APR Schedule and Timeline)
   b. Academic Program Review Self-Study (links to Self-Study Template, Institutional Dashboards, CSU Student Success Dashboard)
   c. APR Internal and External Review (links to sample college APR review criteria, Assessment of Student Learning Subcommittee feedback form, GE Areas and Outcomes Alignment, Guidelines for Graduate Council Evaluation)
   d. Closing the Loop (links to Dept Implementation Plan, Provost Memo, Archives of Academic Program Review Assessment and Presentations)
4. Presentation: 7-year Academic Program Review Cycle:
   https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year/APR_cycle.pdf

Note: Those marked yellow are best practices that may provide helpful information for improving academic program review at CSUB.
Appendix 5: Program Review Best Practices – Interviews with other CSUs

A. Interview Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Time of Zoom Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>Dr. Maureen Scharberg: Associate Provost for Academic Resources &amp; Planning 7/15/2020 9am-10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Dr. Bernadette Muscat: Undergraduate Program Review Officer; Interim Dean, Undergraduate Studies Office Dr. James Marshall: Graduate Program Review Officer; Dean, Division of Research and Graduate Studies 7/9/2020 9am-10am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>Dr. Sharlene Sayegh: Director of Program Review and Assessment; Accreditation Liaison Officer 7/9/2020 10am-11am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Dr. Karin Elliott Brown: Associate Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies; Accreditation Liaison Officer 7/13/2020 3pm-4pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Dr. Jane Dewitt: Associate Dean of Academic Planning 7/9/2020 11am-12pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Dr. Thalia Anagnos: Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education 7/8/2020 1pm-2pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Dr. Katie Olivant: Interim AVP for Academic Affairs Erin Littlepage: Student Success and Community Partnerships Specialist; assessment guru 7/8/2020 2pm-3pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Interview Questions: Targeted Questions

1. East Bay:
   a. CAPR Charge:
      https://docs.google.com/document/d/16t5vMmW98kJb8g0askhM4m_QLe9CUMIi_PTLXND-DeU/edit
   b. Academic Program Review Procedures:
      https://drive.google.com/file/d/1IF7nNAYbb3LzAnGFnn0myCg7htGt2PYI/view

2. Fresno
   a. Data in undergraduate/graduate Program Review:

3. Long Beach
   a. Comprehensive
   b. Academic Senate Policy on Program Review:

4. Los Angeles
   a. Program Review Self-study Handbook:
      http://www.calstatela.edu/sites/default/files/groups/WSCUC%20Accreditation%2C%20Program%20Review%2C%20and%20Assessment/Exhibits/6.7_-_program_review_handbook.pdf

5. San Francisco
a. Academic Program Review Process:
https://ueap.sfsu.edu/sites/default/files/assets/program_review/7th_cycle_process %281%29.pdf

6. San Jose
   a. Program Planning template for accredited programs:
      https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/ugs/faculty/programplanning/index.html
   b. Program Planning Extension Requests:
      https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf

7. Stanislaus
   a. Presentation: 7-year Academic Program Review Cycle:
      https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year_APR_cycle.pdf

C. Interview Questions: General Questions

1. What happens if a program (or a responsible party) is recalcitrant about participating in the review?
2. Which part of the program review process takes most time and effort? How do you address it?
3. What are the best practices in your program review process that are especially helpful?
4. What changes have had the most positive impact on the program review process? What changes would make your review process more effective?
5. Is there any other information in the program review process you consider important?
Appendix 6: Proposed Recommendations for Improving Academic Program Review at CSUB

Academic program review is a faculty-driven, outcomes-based, collaborative, integrated, and continuous process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues of Concern in Program Review</th>
<th>Recommended Changes</th>
<th>Responsible Constituencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance of the Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of assessing student learning outcomes</td>
<td>Have regular training workshops on assessment</td>
<td>Faculty, Assessment Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of UPRC</td>
<td>Select UPRC members as soon as possible</td>
<td>Faculty, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming Program Review Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve program review template</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and reaffirming MOUAP Template</td>
<td>Finalize and approve MOUAP template(^2)</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring programs have sufficient notice for preparing their Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a realistic program review timeline(^3), and affirm adherence to it(^4)</td>
<td>UPRC; Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>通知 programs one year in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve programs to submit a Program Review Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving accredited programs in the university program review process</td>
<td>Establish a modified program review process for accredited programs(^5)</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Senate, Faculty of Accredited Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Annual Report process</td>
<td>Develop a flowchart to integrate annual reports into program reviews(^6)</td>
<td>UPRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and approve annual report template</td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of deans</td>
<td>Ask deans to comment on self-study, program plan, external review report, and UPRC report(^7)</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require deans to participate in MOUAPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require dean to be involved in annual reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study and Program Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing self-studies and program plans in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Develop a program review dashboard(^8)</td>
<td>UPRC, IRPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold program review orientations/workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and post sample program reviews online(^9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the information on undergraduate and graduate programs separately and clearly in the self-studies</td>
<td>Select and post sample program reviews that include both undergraduate and graduate programs</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning External Reviewer visits in advance</td>
<td>Submit a list of potential external reviewers with program reviews</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate and plan external review visit two months in advance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post External Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completing MOUAPs in a timely fashion</td>
<td>Use MOUAPs as the basis for resource allocation</td>
<td>Faculty, Deans, Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post MOUAPs online(^9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation and Reporting of Program Reviews</td>
<td>Better organize and archive program review documents(^10)</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting program review documents</td>
<td>Determine what program review information is posted online and update the website accordingly(^9)</td>
<td>UPRC, Academic Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

1. Some of the recommended changes have already been proposed and/or implemented.
2. See, as an example, the Provost’s Statement in the Concluding Action Memo at San Francisco State (document obtained through email correspondence):
   “The program review process should serve as a basis for strategic planning, including curricular changes, development of new courses, hiring plans, resource requests, and space allocation. Future proposals that affect any of these aspects of the program/department should refer to program review documents, including this concluding action memo.”
3. See, as an example, the Program Performance Review Schedule: 2020-2021 through 2026-2027 by Program at CSU Fullerton (retrieved June 12, 2020, from http://www.fullerton.edu/data/_resources/pdfs/ppo/PPR_Schedule_P_050820.pdf).
4. See, as an example, the Program Plan Extension Request form at San Jose State (retrieved July 1, 2020, from https://www.sjsu.edu/gup/docs/PP/SJSU_ProgramPlan_ExtensionRequestForm.pdf).
5. See, as an example, the Modified Self-Study Report Matrix (for externally accredited programs) at CSU Los Angeles (retrieved June 12, 2020, from http://www.calstatela.edu/apra/program-review-resources).
6. See, as an example, the Seven-Year Academic Program Review Cycle at CSU Stanislaus (retrieved June 30, 2020, from https://www.csustan.edu/sites/default/files/AcademicPrograms/Data/documents/Seven_Year_APR_cycle.pdf).
7. See, as an example, Dean’s Report Template at CSU San Bernardino (retrieved June 30, 2020, from https://www.csusb.edu/academic-programs/program-review/program-review-resources).
9. See, as an example, sample Self-Studies, MOUAPs, and other program review information posted on the Program Assessment & Review Council’s website at CSU Long Beach (retrieved June 11, 2020, from https://www.csulb.edu/academic-senate/program-assessment-review-council-parc).
10. See Appendix 7 for recommendations on how to organize program review documents.
Appendix 7: Recommendations for Organizing Program Review Documents

- Program Review Policies, Procedures, and Templates (by year)
  - CSU Policies
  - CSUB Policies, Procedures, and Templates
    - Program Review Policies
    - Program Review Procedures
    - Self-Study and Program Plan Templates
    - External Reviewer Visit Templates (invitation letter, itinerary, external reviewer report, etc.)
    - Dean’s Review Templates
    - MOUAP Templates
    - Annual Report Templates
    - Program Review Progress Report Template
    - Task Forces
    - Other Changes/Reforms/Recommendations
- UPRC Membership (by year)
- UPRC Meeting Agendas and Minutes (by year)
  - Agendas
  - Minutes
- UPRC Grid (by year)
- UPRC Workshops (by year)
- UPRC Annual Report to Senate (by year)
- UPRC Miscellaneous (by year)
  - UPRC Letterhead
  - Welcome Letters
  - Thank-You Letters
  - Other
- Program Reviews (by program/year)
  - Self-Study and Program Plan
  - External Reviewer Report
  - Program Response to External Reviewer Report
  - Dean’s Report
  - Program Response to Dean’s Report
  - UPRC Report
  - MOUAP
  - Program Review Progress Report
  - UPRC Correspondence with Programs
  - Other
- Annual Reports (by program/department/year)
- Other
Appendix 8: Proposed Survey of Program Directors/Department Chairs

Appendix 8A: Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for taking time off your busy schedule to participate in this survey! The purpose of this survey is to get your perspectives of the academic program review process, so we can incorporate them in the program review revision at CSUB and best assist you with your next program review.

The survey consists of 12 questions and takes approximately 20 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions or concerns about the survey, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you!

Appendix 8B: Survey Questions

Your Name:
Your Title:
Name of Program(s):

1. When was your last program review?

2. In writing your program’s self-study and program plan
   a. Who was the lead person?
   b. Did that person receive any release time or stipend in completing the program review report?
   c. How long did it take to complete the self-study and program plan?
   d. What are the major challenges you experienced, and how did you address them?
   e. What do you think will better help you complete the next self-study and program plan?

3. Regarding the external reviewer visit,
   a. What are the challenges you experienced in scheduling the last external reviewer visit?
   b. How was the external reviewer visit (including the exit meeting with the external reviewer)?
   c. How long did it take for you to receive the external reviewer’s report?
   d. How beneficial was the external reviewer’s report in evaluating your program(s) and addressing your programmatic needs?
   e. What do you think will make your next external reviewer visit more successful?

4. Working with the UPRC,
   a. How helpful was the UPRC workshop in planning and writing your self-study and program plan?
   b. How frequent did you receive UPRC reminders?
   c. What do you think of the UPRC memo/report on your program’s self-study and program plan?
   d. What challenges did you experience in working with the UPRC on your program review?
   e. How do you think can the UPRC better assist you with your next program review?
5. In completing the MOUAP,
   a. What challenges did you experience in drafting the MOUAP?
   b. Who was involved in drafting the MOUAP?
   c. How long did it take to complete the draft MOUAP?
   d. What do you think of the MOUAP meeting with the dean, Academic Programs, the Provost, and others?
   e. From drafting to signing the MOUAP, how long did it take to complete the process?
   f. What would you recommend making the MOUAP process more efficient and effective?

6. Working on the annual report,
   a. When was the last time you completed and submitted the annual program report?
   b. What happened after you submitted the annual report? Did you receive any feedback from your dean and other colleagues?
   c. Was the annual report helpful with the program review process?
   d. What would you recommend making the annual report process more relevant to the program review?

7. Was your Department/Program assessment coordinator helpful with student learning assessment in completing your program review? How can the Department/Program assessment coordinator better assist you?

8. Was the School Assessment Coordinator helpful with student learning assessment in completing your program review? How can the School Assessment Coordinator better assist you?

9. During your last program review cycle, what did you get the most of it?

10. What do you think is the best part of your last program review process?

11. What do you think is most frustrating part of your last program review process?

12. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program review and annual report process at CSUB?

Thank you for your participation! We appreciate your insights!
Appendix 9: Proposed Survey of Deans/Associate Deans

Appendix 9A: Introduction

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you very much for taking time off your busy schedule to participate in this survey! The purpose of this survey is to get your perspectives of the academic program review process, so we can incorporate them in the program review revision at CSUB and make it more efficient and effective.

The survey consists of 10 questions and takes approximately 10 minutes to complete. Should you have any questions or concerns about the survey, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you!

Appendix 9B: Survey Questions

Your Name:
Your Title:

1. When was the last program review in your school you were involved with? What is the name of the program that was reviewed?

2. What was your role in your school’s last program review? What specific activities did you partake in your school’s last program review?

3. Did the Dean’s Office provide any release time or stipend to the lead person(s) of the program review?

4. How was your experience with the external reviewer? What do you think of the external reviewer’s report?

5. How was your experience of the MOUAP process?

6. What challenges did you experience in your school’s last program review? How did you address them?

7. What is most frustrating part of your school’s last program review process?

8. What do you think is the best part of your school’s last program review process?

9. How does the annual program/department report process work in your school? What is your role in the process? How useful and effective is the annual report process in your school?

10. Do you have any suggestions for improving the program review and annual report process at CSUB?

Thank you for your participation! We appreciate your insights!
Dear Dr. Hegde,

During its meeting on August 28, 2020, GECCo APPROVED the attached proposal to modify the Academic Planning Manual. We respectfully submit it for consideration by the CSUB Academic Senate.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Andreas Gebauer, Ph.D., Faculty Director
General Education Program
Appeal Process Revision

Appeals Process.

1. New General Education course approval requests are sent to the appropriate school curriculum committee for review first. With the approval of the school curriculum committee, the proposal is sent to the General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo) for approval to be included in the general education program.

2. The committeeGECCo reviews the request using the guidelines and criteria on record. The committeeGECCo provides a written justification of its findings. In case of rejection, (a) course revision(s) can be made based on the review and resubmitted to the committeeGECCo.

3. Following an unsuccessful re-submission, a written appeal can be filed with CARS the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) of the CSUB Academic Senate that outlines how the petitioner believes the committeeGECCo misinterpreted or otherwise violated its guidelines and procedures on record.

4. CARS-AAC will verify that all rules and procedures identified by the respective committee were followed in the course of the review. CARS-AAC will, if necessary, conduct oral interviews and request further information from the committee.

5. If the CARS-AAC review finds that the guidelines and procedures on record were applied correctly, the appeal is rejected.

6. If the CARS-AAC review finds that the guidelines and procedures on record were applied inappropriately, the committeeGECCo will be advised to reconsider. If the committeeGECCo cannot resolve the issues raised by CARS-AAC, then CARS-AAC will make a final decision.

NOTE: CARS-AAC only reviews whether procedures were followed. It does not review guidelines, criterion or courses.
Hi, Beth

Could you please place this new agenda item for next exec meeting under “GECCo Charge”? Please include Andreas’ email to provide context.

Thanks,
Aaron

Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, Ph.D.
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
CSUB
9001 Stockdale Hwy
Bakersfield, CA 93311
shegde@csub.edu

Hi Aaron,

I have been asked by GECCo to have the Academic Senate review a part of its charge that is described in the attached resolution, RES 1314049. The specific issue rests with point "11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors." In this point, the issue is not the course certification/decertification, but the instructor certification/decertification. Since the GE program does not have its own faculty, the scheduling of courses is not done by the GE program but by the departments. The departments decide who to hire and then who to assign to which course. Thus, especially "decertification" is really not enforceable. This also raises issue with the CBA. So, we really do not know what to make out of this part of our charge and ask for clarification by the Academic Senate.

It will probably best to at the very least separate the two issues (Course certification and decertification and faculty certification/decertification), and then address how, if at all, GECCo and the GE Director should be involved in ensuring that faculty teaching GE courses are
meeting a common set of expectations. This was the original intent of point 11, to improve program integrity and cohesion.

As always, I am happy to meet with any committee that addresses this issue to further explain our concerns and provide feedback.

Thanks,

Andreas

Dr. Andreas Gebauer
Professor of Chemistry
General Education Faculty Director
California State University Bakersfield
RESOLVED: that the Academic Senate recommends approval of the “GEIC proposals entitled ‘Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield ‘and ‘Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield.’

Rationale: In March 2013 the Academic Senate approved a set of “Guiding Principles for General Education Reform at CSUB.” It also established a Task-Force to develop models for a General Education Program based on these principles with a report due back on University Day fall 2013. This report was made to the university community in fall 2013; a series of workshops and sessions were held on GE. The GE Task Force reported their recommendations to the Academic Senate. In November the Academic Senate approved the appointment of a General Education Implementation Committee with the following charge: “The General Education reform implementation committee shall develop Model 3, while paying careful attention to the most valuable features of Model 2, as reflected in the findings of the Task Force on General Education's report to the Academic Senate. In doing so, it may wish to consult with university constituencies, such as Student Affairs and others with expertise in advising, enrollment management, the first year experience, and instruction in basic skills.”

The GEIC met during the month of December, made a preliminary report to the university community on January 10 and to the DCLC on January 15th. This committee has now submitted its recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2014
Sent to the President for approval on March 21, 2014
Approved by the President on April 3, 2014
Governance of the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

The General Education program will be governed by a General Education Curriculum Committee (GECCo), chaired by a Faculty Director. GECCo will have responsibility for administering the GE program and is seen as being inextricably connected to the Senate. The GE Faculty Director will provide monthly reports to the Academic Senate.

Responsibilities of the General Education Curriculum Committee

1. Work in coordination with the designated administrator
2. GE program review and GE program assessment
3. Training and Support of GE faculty
4. Faculty Interest Group (FIG) coordination
5. Skills Reinforcement Group (SRG) coordination
6. Review and revise program learning outcomes
7. Review and revise GE area, skill, theme and course requirement and student learning outcomes
8. Course appeal
9. General Education Modifications (substitutions and waivers)
10. Report to Academic Senate, including requests for any changes to GE structure
11. Certification and decertification of courses and instructors
12. Course review
13. Skill oversight
14. Theme oversight
15. Obtaining broad input from those involved in teaching in the GE Program and from the campus community.

Departments and school curriculum committees will initially approve course submissions. The General Education Curriculum Committee will have final course approval authority. Due to the volume of work relating to the GE program, we suggest that proper compensation be given to committee members.

Composition of the General Education Curriculum Committee

There shall be eight voting members of GECCo with staggered two-year terms: 2 elected representatives from each school (A&H, BPA, NSME, SS&E) and a non-voting GE Faculty Director. The committee will also include a non-voting representative of the office of Academic Programs and a non-voting student representative.

Selection of the GE Faculty Director

The GE Faculty Director will be a tenured faculty member appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee. The committee will put out a call to the campus faculty and will interview candidates prior to making a recommendation to the Provost.

Responsibilities of the GE Faculty Director (to be supported by the appropriate academic administrator)
1. Chair GECCo
2. Ensure that recommendations from GECCo regarding program funding and GE resource management are implemented
3. Support GE program review and GE program assessment
4. Coordinate training and support of GE faculty
5. Facilitate Faculty Interest Groups (FIGs)
6. Facilitate Skills Reinforcement Groups (SRGs)
7. Work collaboratively with department and program chairs and faculty to schedule GE courses to meet students’ needs.

Guidelines and Procedures for GE Certification of Courses

The following guidelines shall govern GE course submissions:

1. All course submissions must be approved by a department. If the course carries a school prefix, it must be approved by the corresponding school curriculum committee.

2. The information contained in proposals for GE certification must be applicable to all sections of the course, regardless of instructor. Departments and programs should carefully review all sections to ensure that they conform to the relevant Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Requirements.

3. Courses that are cross-listed as both graduate and undergraduate are not eligible for certification for general education.

4. If a course is included in a theme, or is required to reinforce a foundational skill, it must also be approved for that purpose.

Management of Themes

Normally there will be no more than 3 to 4 themes. Generation and approval of themes will follow a timeline established by GECCo. The thematic content of themes will be determined according to the following criteria: the need to meet student demand; the need to maintain coherence by limiting the total number of courses in GE; the quality of proposed themes; and their ability to support GE learning outcomes. Theme approval will be informed by comparisons among proposed themes and by balancing themes so they reflect the diverse disciplines of the campus.

Each theme will have a coordinator who will assure breadth and consistent thematic coherence. Theme coordinators should be compensated and will be elected by faculty members participating in the theme FIGs.

Because themes are interdisciplinary, they must demonstrate sufficient cross-disciplinary support for successful implementation. Once a theme has been established the proposal and/or elimination of individual courses within a theme must be advertised (e.g., through memos of intent) and approved by GECCo.

APPENDIX—Proposed Procedures
Existing Curricular Policies

School curriculum committee:
A&H [http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/](http://www.csub.edu/ah/Curriculum_Committee/)
NSM&E [http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml](http://www.csub.edu/nsme/curriculum.shtml)

Approval of New Course:
[http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/](http://www.csub.edu/undergradstudies/AcadSched/)

GE Course Proposals
Proposals for GE course certification will require a completed Course Certification Request Form. It is anticipated that the following information will be included:

1. the course title and number;
2. how often the department is willing to offer the course;
3. the number of units;
4. the PeopleSoft description of the course, including any prerequisites;
5. the established Course Requirements for GE Areas;
6. the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the GE Area, as well as any SLOs specific to the course;
7. the connection of all SLOs (GE area, and course-specific) to the activities and/or assignments students will complete to demonstrate they have met the SLOs;
8. a list of default texts and/or materials to be used in the course;
9. any additional course fees or costs;
10. a description of the grading policy;
11. a statement of the criteria used for evaluating students’ work; and
12. an outline of the topics to be covered.

Process for Course Submission and Certification

1. Course certification proposals will be submitted through the normal pre-established university procedures.

2. Faculty members will initiate the course certification process only after having received approval from the department faculty or other curriculum body with responsibility for curriculum development.

3. Course submissions shall contain the department chair’s signature for confirmation of departmental approval.

4. School Curriculum Committees should review courses and make recommendations to GECCo regarding the appropriateness of GE certification in a timely manner.
5. It is the responsibility of the Faculty Director to ensure that all course certification packets forwarded by the respective school Curriculum Committees are complete. A course shall be reviewed by GECCo within 30 business days.

GECCo may recommend any ONE of the following actions:

a. **Certified**: GECCo may certify the course. The Faculty Director will forward certified course packets to the office of the Associate Vice-President of Academic Programs, the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair.

b. **Revise and Re-Submit**: GECCo may return the certification packet to the submitting faculty member for revision. In this case, a letter of explanation will be provided to the school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair. The submitting faculty member may revise and resubmit the proposal to GECCo indicating that it is a resubmission. Upon review by the Faculty Director, the proposal will be returned to the subcommittee for approval.

c. **Denied Certification**: Courses that have been denied certification will be returned to the respective school curriculum committee chair, Dean, relevant faculty and department chair with an explanation of the reasons they were deemed to be inadequate.

6. The period for certification will be three years. The course may be recertified based upon a review of the course.

Participation Requirements for GE Faculty: FIGs and SRGs

A number of faculty groups will be established to focus on themes (FIGs), the reinforcement of skills (SRGs), and other GE matters. These groups are not expected to be decision-making bodies but serve to facilitate broad consultation, to give guidance to FIG/SRG leaders, to nurture interdisciplinary understanding, and to provide faculty development opportunities. Our long-term goal is to maintain a vital program through ongoing faculty participation. Toward that end, we expect faculty to participate in a minimum of one group each semester they teach within the GE Program and to rotate between groups each semester.
APPENDIX—Philosophy for Designing and Submitting a GE Course

The General Education program at California State University, Bakersfield is designed to enhance the success of students, both at the university and in their life beyond, and to share with students the core values of our university. As such, GE courses are expected to align with the senate-endorsed University Learning Outcomes (ULOs) (Approved by the Academic Senate on March 11, 2010).

The General Education program at CSUB delivers on our promise to student success and our ULOs. Therefore, the GE program at CSUB is not merely a collection of courses representing our rich and diverse academic disciplines, but rather it is an intentional program of study that reflects the central role of the Liberal Arts as defined by the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) vision. This program of study emphasizes a commitment to preparing students with discipline specific knowledge including foundational skills; knowledge integration, reflection, and application; and life-long learning skills.

As a coherent program of study, like major and minor programs, the General Education program requires assessment, oversight, and evaluation. These processes, as carried out by the General Education Curriculum Committee and its various subcommittees, exemplify the tenets of faculty governance. The members of the GEIC share these philosophical statements in the hope that they will help to guide the process by which the GE curriculum and its courses are constructed. In particular, we urge faculty to recognize the following:

- Student success is hindered by the lack of availability of GE courses, especially when students come to expect that particular courses will be offered. Thus faculty are expected to carefully plan their GE contributions and to only offer courses for certification that they can staff and offer on a regular basis.
- Research indicates that a well-integrated and cohesive GE program improves students’ ability to learn and succeed during their college experience and after graduation. Thus faculty members are encouraged to think of the place of their courses in the wider context of the overall GE program.
- The audience for a GE course is potentially very different from that of a course designed for majors. Thus it is appropriate for the disciplines to determine the knowledge and skills that they feel are relevant and important for the general student body to have and to deliver these as GE courses with broad appeal.

Course Evaluation Criteria:

The General Education Curriculum Committee and subcommittees are responsible for certifying courses for inclusion in the General Education curriculum based on the following criteria:

1) Student Learning Outcomes: Faculty submitting courses for certification must demonstrate how students will acquire the information and develop the necessary skills to meet the SLOs for the relevant area(s) through an assessment plan.

2) Course Requirements: Each area of the GE program will have multiple course expectations. Course requirements address logistical issues and course content. Faculty submitting courses for certification must be able to demonstrate how their courses meet these expectations.
Transition Plan for the General Education Program at CSU, Bakersfield

Transition from GE Implementation Committee to GECCo Governance

GECCo shall be constituted as soon as possible. Nominations and elections for GECCo membership shall occur without delay. In the meantime, GEIC is charged with seeking consultation with current and potential GE faculty and continuing to make preparations for implementation of the new GE requirements. Any proposals would come before GECCo for further refinement and ratification before taking effect.

Staggering of Terms in GECCo

Half of the initial terms of GECCo members should be three years in length to ensure continuity. The terms of the other members of the committee, and all subsequent terms of service, shall be two years.
Hi David:

I am in the middle doing the review for one of our temporary faculty that is in Group 1. I was trying to find the policy on how many SOCI's he is required to submit with his file. As I was reading I came across a sentence that might have an error. It is below. I think there is a word missing between “with” and “during” ...I am having a hard time understanding what that sentence means. Thanks so much for your help!

306.2.2 Criteria for Periodic Evaluation of Faculty

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

Isabel C. Sumaya, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of Psychology
California State University, Bakersfield
9001 Stockdale Highway
Bakersfield, Ca 93311
Ph: 661-654-2381  FAX: 661-654-6955
isumaya@csub.edu
rerc@csub.edu

Animal Colony Director
Research Ethics Review Coordinator (RERC), HSIRB & IACUC
MARC U*STAR Program Director
I suspect the marked section was inadvertently added, rather than having something missing. If you take out the bold, underlined section, it's coherent.

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

Hi, Bruce.

In the version I have (dated July 2, 2018) 306.2.2.e says the following:

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with (something is missing here) during the fall semester, prior to the beginning of the evaluation process for the first established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle. (Revised 06-06-17)

I assume what is missing is “department policy”, which may just be an editorial change. Will take it up with EC.

Beth, would you please put this on next week’s EC agenda under the Handbook Error log item?

Thanks,
Aaron

--------------------------------
Dr. S. Aaron Hegde, PhD
Chair, Academic Senate
Chair and Professor, Economics
Director, ERM Program
Aaron and Beth,

306.2.2.e is supposed to say this -- or something darned near like it.

e. Temporary faculty in Groups 1, 3 or 4 shall submit SOCIs in accordance with established departmental policy and for a minimum of two classes for each year taught since their last periodic evaluation. Temporary faculty in Group 1 shall be reviewed during the Spring quarter semester PEF cycle. Temporary faculty in Group 3 or 4 shall be reviewed yearly during the Spring RTP cycle.


Thanks,
Bruce
CONFIDENTIAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 30, 2020
TO: Deborah Boschini, Chair, Academic Senate
FROM: UNIVERSITY REVIEW COMMITTEE (URC)
SUBJECT: Report from University Review Committee

In the academic year 2019-2020, the University Review Committee (URC) reviewed 36 files in the Fall cycle and 45 files in the Spring cycle. At the conclusion of the two review cycles, the URC convened to discuss issues that arose in this year’s review process and identified the following issues.

1. There was a large number of requests for early tenure and promotion. Altogether, there is one (1) request in the Fall cycle (tenure-track, second year) and nine (9) in the Spring cycle (everyone else). According to University Handbook 305.3.4.b, “Early tenure and/or promotion of probationary faculty should be a rare event,” and 305.3.4.c, “Early promotion for tenured faculty is granted for exceptional performance and should be a rare event.” While there are guidelines for early tenure, according to Faculty Handbook 305.2.4.a, “Faculty have compiled a record of exceptional performance in teaching (for counselors, exceptional performance in counseling) and scholarly/creative activities and of acceptable performance in professionally related service at California State University, Bakersfield,” the URC notes that for certain departments,
   a. The “exceptional performance” criteria are not specific enough; or
   b. The “exceptional performance” criteria are too easily achieved; or
   c. The “exceptional performance” criteria do not exist.

   The committee also noted that evaluation criteria vary greatly between departments, even within the same school.

2. Even though the amount of paperwork required is restricted to a three-inch binder, it is still a hassle for the URC to have to visit a specific room on campus to review the files, let alone taking up a room for 10 weeks each year just for this particular purpose.

3. With the increased number of faculty hires in recent years, the number of files to be reviewed is increasing. It is becoming increasingly difficult for URC members to thoroughly review all files.

With the above observations, the URC recommends

1. Certain departments revisit their “exceptional criteria” to make early tenure requests a rarer event. The criteria should also be specific enough for committees and individuals not in the field to carry out evaluation.

2. In the case of early tenure requests, the candidate’s scholarship performance should be evaluated by an external reviewer outside of the university. Their teaching performance evaluated either by a faculty outside of the School, or by the Faculty Teaching & Learning Center.

3. At the School level, unit criteria between departments should be made more uniform as much as possible.

4. The University should consider submission of RTP files to a secured cloud platform, eliminating the need for paper files.
5. Instead of mandatory reviews at years 2, 3, 5, 6, where year 4 is optional, the URC suggests reviews at years 2, 4, and 6, with year 5 being optional.
DATE: October 13, 2020

TO: Dr. Debra Jackson / Interim Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Dean of Academic Programs

CC: Dr. Jorge Moraga/ Assistant Professor, Interdisciplinary Studies
Dr. Tracey Salisbury/ Assistant Professor, Interdisciplinary Studies

FROM: Dr. Alicia Rodriquez / Director, Interdisciplinary Studies Program

RE: Proposal to Create an Ethnic Studies Department

Please find attached a proposal to create a Department of Ethnic Studies at CSUB. This proposal was developed and approved by the Interdisciplinary Studies faculty, Dr. Jorge Moraga, Dr. Tracey Salisbury, and me. Among those who were consulted in the process were Dr. Arno Argueta, Assistant Professor, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures; Ms. Sandra Bozarth, Associate Librarian, Walter W. Stiern Library; Dr. Ivy Cargile, Assistant Professor of Political Science; Dr. Rhonda Dugan, Associate Professor of Sociology; Dr. Kiran Garcha, Assistant Professor of History; Dr. Bill Kelley, Jr., Assistant Professor, Department of Art and Art History; Dr. David Sandles, Lecturer in Teacher Education; and Dr. Adam Sawyer, Assistant Professor of Teacher Education.

In addition, the following Department Chairs and Program Directors were consulted regarding courses that could potentially serve as Ethnic Studies cognate courses: Dr. Reem Abu-Lughod, Criminal Justice; Dr. Janet Armentor-Cota, Sociology; Dr. Steven Frye, English; Dr. Steve Gamboa, Philosophy and Religious Studies; Ms. Kris Grappendorf, Kinesiology; Dr. Joel Haney, Music and Theatre; Dr. Dustin Knepp, Modern Languages and Literatures; Dr. Mark Martinez, Political Science; Mr. Patrick O’Neil, Anthropology; Dr. Adam Sawyer, Liberal Studies; Mr. Jesse Sugarmann, Art and Art History; and Dr. Miriam Vivian, History.
1. Ethnic Studies Department Proposal for CSUB

a. **How and why elevating the Ethnic Studies concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies to an Ethnic Studies Department and degree program will better serve institutional needs:**

Elevating the Ethnic Studies concentration in Interdisciplinary Studies into an Ethnic Studies Department paves the way for an Ethnic Studies degree program, as anticipated by the CSU Academic Master Plan (AMP). Not only does the current national discussion on race relations, inequality, and discrimination among racialized groups make the moment right for the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department, but also new mandates from the California State University and the California State Legislature make the creation of an Ethnic Studies Department imperative.

The California State Legislature’s passage of AB 1460 and Governor Gavin Newsom signing the bill into law requires that students must take a 3-unit course in ethnic studies. In this legislation, ethnic studies is defined as “an interdisciplinary and comparative study of race and ethnicity with special focus on four historically defined racialized core groups: Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, and Latina and Latino Americans.” The policy will go into effect in Fall 2021.

Concurrently, the California State University revised its Title 5 General Education Breadth Requirements to include as part of General Education a minimum of three semester units of “lower-division study designed to understand ethnic studies.”

These new policies together mean that there will be an urgent need to offer an adequate number of sections of approved Ethnic Studies courses to meet student demand, which will allow our students to graduate in a timely manner and help CSUB meet its graduation targets. At CSUB, this translates into a need for as many as 34 sections of introductory required Ethnic Studies courses each year. Though courses that address or engage race and ethnicity have long been offered in disciplines such as Sociology, History, and Anthropology, understanding the unique genesis of the discipline of Ethnic Studies helps explain why the new mandates must be met by – and are required to be met by – courses offered in that specific discipline.

In 1969, the San Francisco campus of the California State University became the birthplace of the academic discipline of Ethnic Studies. The discipline, which recently celebrated fifty years since its establishment, has grown into a robust, complex and diverse area of study that seeks to provide a wholistic and thorough examination of the histories and experiences of the traditionally underrepresented, racialized groups in the United States: Native Americans, African Americans, Chicano/a/x/Latina/o/x Americans, and Asian American/Pacific Islanders. In the context of exploring the experiences of these groups, the discipline seeks to provide a critical examination and analysis of racism and white supremacy in this country. Furthermore, as a discipline born from activism, it seeks to help students understand and promote participatory democracy, community responsiveness, and social justice.
The global pandemic and the murder of George Floyd have given rise to the current national conversation on race and ethnic relations and have highlighted systemic inequality and discrimination across the educational, employment, judicial, health care, and economic systems in the United States. To members of the groups that have experienced discrimination, the current climate has produced a new, vibrant, and perhaps unparalleled fiery wave of social justice activism. In addition, many White Americans are awakening to the depths of these inequities and likewise calling for change. Now is the time for CSUB to do its part in addressing the problems that racialized Americans face by not only offering Ethnic Studies courses, but by establishing an Ethnic Studies Department.

An Ethnic Studies Department will serve as a place to educate students and as a center for frank discussions that will promote positive social change in our region. Exposure to the discipline’s teachings and explorations of systemic racism and discrimination, as well as its emphasis on activism, will help shine the harsh light of reality on the shortcomings and problems not only affecting the nation, but on those affecting our community. Furthermore, the CSU AMP includes a planned program for an Ethnic Studies Bachelor of Arts degree. An established Ethnic Studies Department, combined with the courses it will offer to serve the new Ethnic Studies requirement, will facilitate the full degree program’s development by having firmly built a foundation of key lower-division program components for the full BA.

The opportunity to take Ethnic Studies courses that fulfill General Education requirements will serve all students – regardless of race or ethnicity – in the modern, diverse workplace and world in which they live, and exposure to the GE courses will serve as a conduit to the BA program anticipated by the AMP. The awareness of the complex histories and experiences of these racialized groups – and of the lingering legacy of white supremacy in our community, and how it may insidiously manifest itself in everyday life – provides students with the opportunity to better serve and work with those with whom they might not share cultural experiences.

Finally, it should be noted that CSUB has long been laying the foundation for the establishment of an Ethnic Studies Department. In 2014, Chancellor Timothy White formed a statewide CSU Task Force on the Advancement of Ethnic Studies. While serving as President of CSUB, Dr. Horace Mitchell chaired the task force, which released its recommendation in January 2016, calling for the expansion of Ethnic Studies at the CSU. That document led to the hiring, in 2017, of two new faculty members trained in Ethnic Studies, Dr. Jorge Moraga and Dr. Tracey Salisbury. The intention was that they would provide the seeds from which a new program would grow. The progress sputtered, however, resulting in a disservice to CSUB’s students, and disappointment and frustration on the part of the new faculty.

An effort that paralleled President Mitchell’s Ethnic Studies Task Force chairmanship was the planning, application, awarding, and implementation of a National Endowment for the Humanities Grant, “Crossing Borders, Making Connections: Interdisciplinarity,
Humanities, and Ethnic Studies,” under the co-direction on Dr. Dustin Knepp, Associate Professor of Modern Languages and Literature and then Director of Interdisciplinary Studies, and Dr. Liora Gubkin-Malicdem, Associate Dean of Arts and Humanities and Professor of Religious Studies at CSUB. The grant funded an on-campus discussion group that explored the discipline of Ethnic Studies, engaged in community outreach efforts, and worked to create an awareness among the CSUB campus community and its service region of the purpose and need for the anticipated Ethnic Studies Department.

Given the new CSU and State of California Ethnic Studies mandates, CSUB’s central role in promoting the expansion of Ethnic Studies, as represented by President Horace Mitchell’s service on the Ethnic Studies Task Force, and the stage set by the “Crossing Borders,” grant, now is the time for CSUB to act in earnest and honor its commitment to our students, the faculty who will teach the new Ethnic Studies courses, and the community that the university serves. The folly of hiring faculty without providing them with a designated home academic department has been an injustice to those faculty and will be so to new faculty hired to meet the Ethnic Studies requirement. Offering Ethnic Studies courses without supporting a broader discipline-specific program with a department would undermine the sincerity of university’s commitment to Ethnic Studies and would reduce the requirement to mere tokenism.

b. How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs:

The Interdisciplinary Studies faculty who are expected to migrate to an Ethnic Studies Department expect that the new home for the department and the degree program will be in the School of Social Sciences and Education (SSE). Currently, Interdisciplinary Studies, in which the Ethnic Studies concentration lay, is housed in Academic Programs. Interdisciplinary Studies will remain in Academic Programs and after any student who is pursuing the Ethnic Studies concentration completes the program under the teach out policy, the concentration will be dissolved.

c. How will the change affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload:

The founding faculty of the Ethnic Studies Department and degree program anticipated by the AMP will have the option of staying in the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, where they will continue to undergo review using the Modern Languages and Literatures RTP criteria under which they were hired, or they can choose to move to the new Ethnic Studies program where they will be considered Ethnic Studies faculty and undergo future reviews using the new Ethnic Studies RTP criteria, beginning when they move to the new Ethnic Studies Department. Once the faculty member chooses to move to Ethnic Studies Department and accepts that they will undergo all future reviews under the new Ethnic Studies RTP criteria, beginning when they move to the new Ethnic Studies Department, the decision is final and irrevocable.
In addition to the existing INST faculty who are expected to migrate to the new Department of Ethnic Studies, additional faculty, at the minimum rank of lecturer, must be hired to meet the demand created by the new Ethnic Studies requirement. An insufficient number of qualified faculty will mean an inadequate number of sections offered, resulting in bottlenecks that will hinder students’ academic progress and negatively affect graduation rates.

Assuming a 4% increase each fall semester in first-time freshmen, the projected enrollments will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2020</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Fall 2022</th>
<th>Fall 2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTF</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>1,529</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,653</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projected increase in first-time freshmen enrollments translates into the need for as many as 34 sections of approved Ethnic Studies courses to be offered annually. Therefore, this expected demand anticipates the need to hire two full-time lecturers beginning in Fall 2020, and an additional lecturer in Fall 2021. The need for yet another full-time lecturer is expected in the program’s five year of operation, AY 2025-2026.

With regard to workload, it is expected that the department chair would receive six (6) WTUs of reassigned time each semester, for a total of twelve (12) WTUs of reassigned time each academic year. Aside from the reassigned time for the department chair, faculty workload and assignments will conform to the contract in effect between the California Faculty Association and the California State University.

d. How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities, and workload:

It is anticipated that the two Interdisciplinary Studies tenure-track faculty, Dr. Jorge Moraga and Dr. Tracey Salisbury, will leave that program and become the inaugural faculty of the new Ethnic Studies Program for which both faculty will develop new courses as part of the Ethnic Studies general major and for concentrations in Black Studies and Latina/o/x Studies. The departments/programs that are able to offer courses that may support Ethnic Studies by serving as cognate courses include the following: Anthropology, Art and Art History, Criminal Justice, English, History, Kinesiology, Music, Political Science, Religious Studies, Liberal Studies, and Theatre.

With the exception of support for library materials identified below, because the faculty who will comprise the faculty are currently supported through existing programs, the greatest expense that will be incurred will be in the need for support staff. Support staff in Academic Programs currently serve the Interdisciplinary Studies Program, but as the Ethnic Studies Program will be housed in an academic school, it will need a new Administrative Support Coordinator within the school.
Lastly, as noted above, with the implementation of AB 1460 by Fall 2021, our campus will need to offer at least 15 sections each semester of introductory courses that satisfy the Ethnic Studies requirement. Therefore, the need to hire full-time faculty trained in Ethnic Studies (or related fields) will remain of vital importance. Despite the grim budget realities anticipated over the next three years as a result of the global pandemic, it will remain vital that institutional support for this new unit be a priority. It would be a disservice to the CSUB community if the university advances an Ethnic Studies Department only to have its Ethnic Studies faculty be limited to teaching introductory courses that satisfy AB 1460, thus crippling program’s ability to develop and implement the anticipated full BA curriculum and programmatic offerings.

e. What impact will the plan have on Information Resources (library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding:

Associate CSUB Librarian, Sandra Bozarth, has indicated that while the full-time faculty who teach in Interdisciplinary Studies (and who are expected to teach in the Ethnic Studies Program), have not requested additions to the existing databases or new journal subscriptions, the costs could change if new courses are added that will require additional support. Below are the costs that could be incurred should the existing faculty request additional support once the program is approved. It is worth noting that the faculty who are expected to teach in Ethnic Studies are current CSUB faculty whose current needs are supported with existing resources, and that costs for current existing courses can fluctuate each semester, depending on the media needed to support a course. The below represents an estimate of the possible costs that would be involved, should the faculty need new materials.

JOURNALS:
1. Title-by-title subscriptions will cost about $3000-$10000 per year OR
2. additional journal databases between $2000 and $8000 per year per

BOOKS & MONOGRAPHS:
$3000 – $4000 to purchase subject specific books (print and/or electronic; electronic are more expensive but allow greater access to students) related to the specific courses that are going to be offered.

MEDIA:
3-year subscriptions to videos with the possibility of maybe purchasing some in perpetuity. This can get up to $6000 per class for perpetual (prices tend to be between $375 and $1200 perpetual) or $150 per video per year on either a 1 or 3 year license. This would be where a significant amount of money would be spent in the first 2-3 years of the program.

Minimum suggested startup costs: $5000 - $15000
Sandra Bozarth writes, “If this funding is not available at the start of the academic year, the department could likely be sustained with current materials but faculty requests for new materials may not be approved and will be combined with other library materials requests as is normal practice.”

In addition, Bozarth indicated that the program should plan on an annual increase in costs of approximately 5-7 percent each year. Please see the accompanying Five-Year Budget Projection for an estimation of costs.

In terms of overall costs, as the Five-Year Budget Projection indicates, the new program represents a significant investment by CSUB, the CSU, and the people of the State of California. Indeed, if the CSU is to live up to its moniker, “The People’s University,” CSUB will do well to support a program that is truly inclusive of all the people of California.

f. Plan for effecting the change:
The faculty would work closely with the Dean of the school in which the program would be housed, the Office of the Provost, Academic Programs, Academic Operations and Support, as well as faculty groups, including the Academic Senate, the General Education Curriculum Committee, and the Curriculum Committee of the School in which Ethnic Studies will be housed to ensure a smooth program start up.

October 13, 2020
THE FORMATION AND MODIFICATION OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS: PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

PRINCIPLES:

1. Requests to change the structure of a department should usually emerge from the concerns of the faculty and/or the dean directly involved. However, other individuals of the university may suggest that the faculty examine the effectiveness of the present departmental structure.

2. A new department may be formed as an entirely new entity, as a result of dividing an existing department, or as a result of combining two or more existing departments.

3. If the change affects more than one school, then more than one dean will be involved, so any references to a dean in this policy statement imply more than one dean if the situation so indicates.

4. Collegiality is the fundamental principle upon which the governance of the university rests. At any point in this process, any of the parties involved may consult informally with anyone in the campus community whose contribution seems desirable.

PROCEDURES

1. If someone suggests a change in departmental structure, the relevant faculty, the appropriate academic dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs should engage in considerable informal discussion. These people should solicit advice from other potentially interested parties, possibly including faculty in other departments or schools as well as the Academic Senate.

2. When informal discussions appear to have elicited all of the relevant issues and concerns, the faculty who wish to form the new department should write a proposal that addresses the following points:

   (a) How and why the change will better serve institutional needs;

   (b) How the change will affect the governance and delivery of curriculum and degree programs;

   (c) How the change will affect recruitment, appointment, review, promotion and tenure of faculty, as well as faculty assignments and workload;

   (d) How the change will affect the need for financial support, including operating expenses, equipment, facilities and staffing;

   (e) What impact the plan will have on Information Resources (Library books and subscriptions, computing equipment and support) and what is the source for additional funding; and

   (f) A plan for effecting the change.

3. The proposal must pass through the following levels of review in the order indicated. The individual(s) at each level shall review the proposal, consult with others as seems appropriate, and then either forward it to the next level with a positive recommendation or return it to the previous level with a written explanation of the reasons for withholding approval:

   (a) The appropriate academic dean, who shall inform any potentially interested faculty and invite their consultation;

   (b) The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, who shall inform the Council of Deans and invite their consultation;
(c) The Academic Senate, through the Executive Committee, shall forward this proposal to Standing Committees or to the Full Senate at its reasoned discretion before taking final action; and

(d) The President, who shall inform the Cabinet and invite their consultation before delivering his/her final decision regarding the proposal.

4. If the proposal fails to receive approval at any level, those involved may choose to revise and resubmit it.

APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE APRIL 10, 1997
APPROVED BY PRESIDENT ARCINIEGA MAY 5, 1997
TITLE MODIFIED BY THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE 2012
PROCEDURES MODIFIED AND APPROVED BY ACADEMIC SENATE OCTOBER 24, 2013
APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT ON NOVEMBER 14, 2013
# ETHS Department Five-Year Budget Projection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 - 2021-22</th>
<th>Year 2 - 2022-23</th>
<th>Year 3 2023-24</th>
<th>Year 4 2024-25</th>
<th>Year 5 - 2025-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel - Salary and Benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Reassignment</td>
<td>23,916.00</td>
<td>23,916.00</td>
<td>23,916.00</td>
<td>23,916.00</td>
<td>23,916.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASC I</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
<td>62,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk and chair</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>3,870.00</td>
<td>1,290.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printer (ASC)</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>5,966.00</td>
<td>5,966.00</td>
<td>5,966.00</td>
<td>5,966.00</td>
<td>5,966.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Resources</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,500.00</td>
<td>11,025.00</td>
<td>11,576.00</td>
<td>12,154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Total</strong></td>
<td>332,452.00</td>
<td>411,756.00</td>
<td>408,991.00</td>
<td>433,458.00</td>
<td>547,326.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13-Oct-20
Referral: Align University Handbook language and the catalog process for graduate student grievances and appeals with the current policy.

Rationale: Graduate programs are different from undergraduate programs in several ways that necessitate a unique grievance/appeals process. The current process, as outlined in the catalog, has been effective and addresses some of the unique requirements of graduate programs including (1) that the review process be timely due to the short degree time in graduate programs, (2) that the review process recognize the structure of graduate programs, (3) that the policy recognize that we have historically had an issue with programs being too lenient in response to appeals (rather than too strict) and this has sometimes threatened program certifications and accreditation, and (4) that the current policy meets the accreditation and certification requirements for our existing graduate programs.

Some changes (mostly minor) are suggested for the graduate process to more closely align the language and processes used for undergraduate and graduate processes, while still maintaining some of the differences that are necessitated by the differences between undergraduate and graduate programs.
## Summary of Suggested Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Undergrad Process</th>
<th>Current Grad Process</th>
<th>New Grad Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Student Complaint and Grievance Process&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Appeals and Grievances&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Student Complaints and Grievances Process&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informal Stage (i.e. complaint)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Informal Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Informal Stage (i.e. complaint)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student brings complaint to instructor</td>
<td>• Student brings complaint to graduate program or credential director</td>
<td>• Student brings complaint to instructor (only applicable if course or grade related)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If unresolved, student brings complaint to chair</td>
<td>• If unresolved, student can file a formal grievance</td>
<td>• Student brings complaint to graduate program or credential director for internal program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If unresolved, student brings complaint to school dean</td>
<td>• If unresolved, student can file a formal grievance</td>
<td>• If unresolved, student can file a formal grievance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If unresolved, student can file a formal grievance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal Stage (i.e. grievance)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formal Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formal Stage (i.e. grievance)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student completes &quot;Student Grievance Form&quot;</td>
<td>• Student completes &quot;Academic Appeal Form&quot;</td>
<td>• Student completes &quot;Graduate Student Grievance Form&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students obtains signatures from instructor, chair, and school dean</td>
<td>• Student obtains signature and recommendation from program director</td>
<td>• Student obtains signature and recommendation from program director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student submits form to Academic Programs</td>
<td>• Form routed to school dean for signature and recommendation</td>
<td>• Form routed to school dean for signature and recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Form routed to Academic Programs for Associate Dean signature and decision</td>
<td>• Form routed to Academic Programs for Associate Dean of Graduate Studies signature and decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hearing Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No applicable graduate process</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board members composed of 2 undergrad students, 3 faculty (2 tenured), and 1 SSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Dean schedules hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearing held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Decision made and communicated to student and instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal Stage</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeal Stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Associate Dean can reject the appeal or refer to President</td>
<td>• Student can appeal the decision of the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies to the AVP AA.</td>
<td>• AVP AA can reject the appeal or refer to President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• President’s decision is final</td>
<td>• AVP AA can reject the appeal or refer to President</td>
<td>• President’s decision is final</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Complaints Appeals and Grievances
A graduate or post-baccalaureate student who experiences difficulties arising from course evaluation, judgment of performance, graduate degree requirements, advancement to candidacy, general regulations, and/or other grievance situations should discuss the issues first with the appropriate graduate or credential program director. If the complaint is still unresolved at this point, the student may then, and only then, file a formal grievance using the Graduate Student Grievance Form. The grievance will be reviewed, in sequential order, by (1) the graduate program following internal policies and overseen by the program director, (2) the relevant school academic dean, and, finally, (3) the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies AVP for Academic Affairs. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies will review the grievance and review process and will make a final decision on the grievance. The formal appeal process must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance (excluding summer term). A separate policy applies to appeals of a denial of admission. Please see section titled Denial of Admission for information regarding that policy.
PROPOSED UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK REVISIONS

APPENDIX D: STUDENT COMPLAINT AND GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

The policy and procedures specified herein deal only with individual student complaints and/or grievances against the actions and/or decisions of faculty, academic administrators, or staff professionals. The complaints and/or grievances may concern but are not restricted to (1) an assigned final course grade, (2) administration of records, (3) re-admission to a program, or (4) requirements for program completion.

Group grievances are not permitted. Complaints and/or grievances will not involve allegations of dishonesty or abuse of professional responsibility as such allegations fall strictly under formal University disciplinary proceedings.

Procedures for redress of grievances must protect the respondent against unsubstantiated and false charges of bias or unfairness. Therefore, in a grievance there is a presumption that procedures have been fairly followed. It is the responsibility of the grievant to demonstrate otherwise. The final responsibility for assigning or changing a student’s record rests solely with the faculty, academic administrators, or staff professional.

In this document, a student can refer to baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate (graduate) levels, with level of specificity indicated where procedures differ.

Article I Definitions

Section 1

A. "Complaint" is defined as any unwritten dispute arising with a student under terms of Article 2. A "Complaint" may be any point of issue between a student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, in which a student feels an abridgement of academic rights or benefits has occurred.

B. "Grievance" is defined as a written dispute arising with a student under terms of Article 2. A "Grievance" is a difference, presented in writing, that may arise between a student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, with respect to, but not necessarily limited to:

1) violation of established academic policies and regulations: defined as those policies and regulations outlined in the respondent’s course syllabus, the University’s current Catalog, and/or the University’s current Class Schedule. (e.g., examination policies, advisement policies, registration procedures, etc.) The violation must have resulted in a direct and adverse impact on the Grievant’s student record.

2) Clerical error: A "clerical error" means an error made by the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, in reviewing, estimating, evaluating, or posting student records.

3) Prejudicial evaluation: For prejudicial evaluation to be present, the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional must have applied a different standard to the Grievant than applied to other students in the same situation. Also, the action must have adversely impacted the Grievant’s student record.
4) Capricious, Arbitrary, capricious, or unequal/inconsistent evaluation: For arbitrary, capricious, or unequal/inconsistent evaluation to be present, the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional must have changed the standards of evaluation during the semester without notification. Since changes in evaluation standards can and do occur during a semester, the change must have occurred abruptly and/or without justified apparent reason (e.g., two days after the mid-term examination and without prior discussion, the faculty member declares there will be a series of short quizzes). Finally, for arbitrary, capricious, or unequal/inconsistent evaluation to be present, the Grievant has to show that the change had a direct, singular, and adverse impact on the Grievant’s student record.

C. “Grievant” is defined as the individual lodging the complaint and/or grievance.

D. “Respondent” is defined as the faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional most directly responsible for the alleged action(s) and/or decision(s) resulting in the complaint and/or grievance.

Article 2 General Provisions

Section 1 It is the desire of the University that any Grievance be handled in a timely manner. The Grievance procedures must adhere to the time deadlines stated in the grievance procedures.

Section 2 This document is not intended to inhibit the resolution of a problem in any satisfactory informal way.

Section 3 At any point in these grievance proceedings the Grievant may move to withdraw the Grievance or accept a solution.

Section 4 The Ombudsman may be consulted by the Grievant at the earliest opportunity. Deadlines may be extended at the request of the Ombudsman to the relevant School Dean or the Academic Vice President (e.g., if the Grievant is in a course of the respondent the following semester, an extension may be granted).

Section 5 The University has a strict policy of zero tolerance of actual or implied violence. If at any time a Grievant engages in harassment or intimidation, the grievance will immediately become a disciplinary matter to be dealt with by campus security.

Section 6 Complaints and/or Grievances may be brought against the actions and/or decisions of faculty, administrators, staff in admissions, records, financial aid, counseling, placement or other student service offices for failure to adhere to written campus policies or for procedures or actions that constitute arbitrary, capricious, or unequal application of those procedures.

Section 7 A complaint and/or grievance may be initiated on the basis of a claim of: (refer to Article 1 for definitions)

A. Violation of established academic policies and regulations
B. Clerical error
C. Prejudicial evaluation
D. Arbitrary, capricious, or unequal/inconsistent evaluation

Article 3 Complaint Procedures
PART A: Undergraduate student procedures

Section 1 Before resorting to grievance, a student shall exhaust all complaint procedures herein at the department level. Grievance procedures, as outlined in Article 4, should not be invoked until the complaint has been thoroughly addressed at the department level.

Section 2 The student shall first address the complaint to the concerned faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional most directly responsible for the alleged action(s) and/or decision(s) resulting in the complaint. Complaints shall be initiated within one semester, excluding summer, of the incident giving rise to the complaint. If the complaint cannot be resolved by the student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, the student should meet with the Department Chairperson/Director to discuss their complaint.

Section 3 If the student and the Department Chairperson/Director cannot resolve the complaint, the student should meet with the appropriate school or departmental Dean to discuss their complaint.

Section 4 If the complaint is still unresolved after this point, the student may then, and only then, file a written grievance as outlined in Article 4. In no case should the informal resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

PART B: Graduate student procedures

Section 1 Before resorting to grievance, a student shall exhaust all complaint procedures within their program. Grievance procedures, as outlined in Article 4, should not be invoked until the complaint has been thoroughly addressed within the graduate program.

Section 2 The student shall first address the complaint to the concerned faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional most directly responsible for the alleged action(s) and/or decision(s) resulting in the complaint. Complaints shall be initiated within one semester, excluding summer, of the incident giving rise to the complaint. If the complaint cannot be resolved by the student and faculty, academic administrator, or staff professional, the student should meet with the Graduate Program Director to discuss their complaint.

Section 3 If the complaint is still unresolved after this point, the student may then, and only then, file a written grievance as outlined in Article 4. In no case should the informal resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

Article 4 Grievance Procedures

PART A: Undergraduate student procedures

Section 1 Before a student may invoke the grievance procedures specified herein, the student shall first exhaust all complaint procedures as outlined in Article 3. In no case should the informal
resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

Section 2 A student may initiate formal grievance procedures by filing an Undergraduate Student Grievance Form with the Office of the Academic Vice President, or designee, within a period of two (2) weeks following the date that the complaint procedures were concluded, as indicated by the relevant Dean.

Section 3 Upon receiving a written notice of grievance, the Academic Vice President shall inform the Presiding Officer of the Grievance Review Board, the Ombudsman, and the appropriate Dean of the School or Department, in which the grievance occurred, of the grievance. The Grievance Review Board Presiding Officer shall verify that the student has complied with all procedures outlined in Article 3.

Section 4 At any point in these formal grievance proceedings the Grievant may move to withdraw the grievance or accept an informal solution.

PART B: Graduate student procedures

Section 1 Before a student may invoke the grievance procedures specified herein, they shall first exhaust all complaint procedures as outlined in Article 3. In no case should the informal resolution of a complaint take longer than one semester (excluding summer) and formal grievances must be initiated within one semester of the incident giving rise to the grievance.

Section 2 A student may initiate formal grievance procedures by filing a Graduate Student Grievance Form with their relevant Graduate Program Director within a period of two (2) weeks following the date that the complaint procedures were concluded.

Section 3 Upon receiving a written notice of grievance, the Graduate Program Director will verify that the student has complied with all procedures outlined in Article 3. The Graduate Program Director will then initiate the graduate grievance review procedure.

Section 4 The Graduate Program Director will review the grievance or the Graduate Program Director will oversee the internal program process for grievance review and will make the recommendation on the grievance form and route it to the school dean along with any relevant documentation. The school dean or their designee will review the grievance and will make their recommendation on the grievance form and route it to the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. The Associate Dean of Graduate Studies will review the grievance and review process and will make a final decision on the grievance.

Section 5 At any point in these formal grievance proceedings the Grievant may move to withdraw the grievance. If the Grievant does not withdraw their grievance, the grievance review process will continue through all stages of recommendation and review as outlined in Section 4.

Article 5 Grievance Review Board

Undergraduate student procedures (no equivalent graduate student procedures)
Section 1  Be it that grievances may encompass both academic and non-academic issues, the Grievance Review Board shall be composed of seven persons: the Presiding Officer, three full-time faculty members, at least two of whom shall be tenured members of academic departments, one full-time student-service professional staff members, and two full-time students.

Section 2  The Presiding Officer shall be the Dean of Academic Programs or his/her designee. He/she shall be responsible for ensuring that all procedures are followed in the seating of the Review Board and in the conduct of its hearings and deliberations. The Presiding Officer shall vote only in case of a tie. The Presiding Officer shall also insure that all participants in each hearing are officially notified of the confidential nature of the hearing and all information and data presented therein.

Section 3  The Grievance Review Board shall be a standing committee, with board members selected each academic year. At the beginning of each academic year, the Presiding Officer shall draw two names from the pool of currently enrolled full-time students, three names from the pool of full-time faculty at least two of whom should be tenured members of academic departments, and one name from the pool of full-time student-service professional staff. Administrative-level Faculty and staff personnel will be excluded from the pool. University policy regarding definitions of full-time faculty, staff members, administrators, and students shall apply. Upon selection, if a faculty, staff, or student declines to serve, another name shall be drawn in their place. Once the position is accepted, it will be for the duration of the academic year.

Section 4  After the regular Board members are selected, alternates shall be drawn using the same method. Three full-time faculty, one full-time student-service professional staff, and two full-time students shall be selected as alternates.

Section 5  Any board member, other than the Presiding Officer, may be permanently replaced with an alternate during the academic year:
A. if faculty or staff - are no longer employed by CSUB as a full-time employee;
B. if a student - are no longer enrolled full-time or if placed on academic probation in any semester during the academic year of service.
C. if absent from any scheduled meeting of the Grievance Review Board, in which member notification and availability were confirmed, then the Presiding Officer may permanently remove that member from the board at his/her discretion.
D. if deemed to be exhibiting inappropriate behavior via a consensus vote of all remaining members of the board.

Section 6  If a board member is replaced with an alternate, then the Presiding Officer shall immediately draw another name from the appropriate pool to fill the vacant alternate position.

Section 7  A quorum shall consist of all current members of the Grievance Review Board, excluding alternates.

Section 8  All hearings shall be closed. The Grievant and the Respondent shall each have the right to have the Ombudsman present as a non-participant observer at the hearings. Attendance shall be limited to the Grievant, the Respondent, the Ombudsman, witnesses, if any, while giving evidence, and the Review Board. Since this is not a legal action and grievant has ultimate legal recourse, attorneys shall be excluded.
Section 9  Formal grievance hearings shall not be held during the Summer or Christmas Winter breaks unless Grievant, Respondent, entire Board, and witnesses agree. Every effort shall be made to resolve the grievance within the term filed.

Section 10  The Presiding Officer shall inform all parties to the grievance of the time, date, and location of the hearing, names of the presiding board members, as well as decisions on other matters that may affect the hearing.

Section 11  Both the Grievant and the Respondent then have two working days after the date of notice of presiding board members in which they may each request to the Presiding Officer up to one board member be temporarily replaced with an alternate due to cause. The Presiding Officer shall immediately grant or deny such requests, and these decisions shall be final for all purposes. Those temporarily excused for cause shall regain their positions once the Review Board’s proceedings for that specific grievance have concluded.

Section 12  The Board shall normally convene within fourteen (14) working days from notice of grievance. The Presiding Officer shall be responsible for meeting with the Board at an appropriate time before the beginning of the hearing to familiarize the members with the procedures, as outlined in Article 6.

Section 13  The content of the proceedings in a grievance hearing is confidential, and the Board recommendations resulting there from shall not be made public by any participant in the hearings. In the event these matters should become public, the University, as are appropriate, may make such public statements. This policy of confidentiality shall not preclude such discussion of the case by the opposing parties as may be necessary to prepare for the hearings.

Section 14  Subject to Sections 15-23O below, both the Grievant and the Respondent may offer evidence and call witnesses, with the Grievant doing so first.

Section 15  Within the guidelines established by these procedures, and subject to overrule by a majority of Board members, the Presiding Officer may establish necessary rules for the conduct of the hearing, including decisions involving procedural issues.

Section 16  Any relevant evidence shall be admitted and the Presiding Officer shall have the discretion to rule out evidence if in his/her judgment such evidence is essentially repetitious or irrelevant.

Section 17  During the course of the proceedings the Grievant and the Respondent shall not discuss the case with members of the Review Board outside the hearings. If, in the judgment of the Board either Grievant or Respondent has harassed or attempted to intimidate the other or any Board member, the Board may initiate disciplinary procedures. (See Article 8 below)

Section 18  Both parties may make an opening statement. The Grievant has the burden of proof, and shall demonstrate by a preponderance of evidence that the Grievant was directly wronged by the action that gave rise to the Grievance. After the opening statements, both parties shall answer questions the Board may have regarding the case. Both parties may then question each other, as well as all witnesses. Any documents submitted as evidence shall be made available by the Presiding Officer to both parties.

Section 19  The Grievant or Respondent may sign a waiver allowing the Board to have access to confidential information pertinent to the case. However, the rights of privacy of third parties (such as other students in the course who are not involved in the case, or other faculty who may teach similar courses) shall be respected.

Section 20  The Grievant and Respondent may request information from each other concerning the case. The Grievant, for example, may request a class list with student names and an overall
grade distribution, but in no circumstance will the grades earned by specific students in the course, or student identification numbers, be released without their written permission. Moreover, the Board shall not have access to, nor consider, records of testimony about previous academic performance of the Grievant in other courses or in prior grievances.

Section 21 The Board shall not have access to nor consider records of testimony about the previous use of sanctions by the Respondent nor previous instances of grievances.

Section 22 A tape recording of the hearing shall be kept and filed in the Office of the Academic Vice President. It shall be retained for two calendar years, and then shall be erased. The tape recording is to remain confidential.

Section 23 Each party may present a closing statement. The Respondent goes first. Any closing statements shall be limited to the evidence presented. There shall be no questioning of the parties during or after the closing statements.

Article 6 Grievance Review Board Decisions & Ad Hoc Assessment Committee

Undergraduate student procedures (no equivalent graduate student procedures)

Section 1 The decision of the Board must be consistent with campus and CSU policy. The Presiding Officer shall notify the Grievant, Respondent, and the appropriate administrator of the Board’s finding.

Section 2 If the Board found that a legitimate grievance has occurred, the Presiding Officer shall request the Respondent to reconsider the grieved action in light of the Board’s finding. If the Respondent agrees, he/she shall make the appropriate corrective action must be initiated within seven (7) working days after notification of the Board’s finding.

Section 3 If the Board recommends the appropriate corrective action change but the Respondent refuses to accept it, then the Presiding Officer shall convene an ad hoc Assessment Committee composed of two faculty or two staff members whose field of expertise is appropriate for the department or unit affected. The Presiding Officer shall be a non-voting member of the Assessment Committee. The Presiding Officer shall inform the Respondent of the decision reached by the Assessment Committee.

Section 4 If the Respondent refuses to comply with the decision of the Assessment Committee, he/she shall notify the Presiding Officer must be notified by the Respondent within seven (7) working days after receiving notice of the committee’s decision.

Section 5 In the event the Respondent refuses to comply with the decision of the Assessment Committee, the Presiding Officer shall refer the matter to the University’s President for final resolution.

Article 7 Appeals

PART A: Undergraduate student procedures
Section 1 Either the Grievant or the Respondent may appeal the finding of the Grievance Review Board, but the Respondent may not appeal the decision of the Assessment Committee. The party wishing to appeal the finding of the Grievance Review Board must deliver a written appeal to the Presiding Officer, with copies to the opposing party. This appeal shall be delivered to the Presiding Officer within fourteen (14) working days from the date of the receipt of the finding of the Grievance Review Board.

Section 2 The only grounds for appeal are:
A. Substantial departure from the procedures established in this document so as to seriously prejudice the outcome of the hearing;
B. Prejudicial treatment by the Grievance Review Board.

Section 3 The appeal document shall specify the following:
A. That it is an appeal;
B. The name and current address and telephone number of the person making the appeal;
C. The reasons for the appeal and the facts supporting those reasons.

Section 4 The Presiding Officer may bring final resolution to the grievance by either electing to reject the appeal based on lack of evidence, or by referring the matter to the University’s President. The Presiding Officer’s decision to either reject, or refer, the appeal shall be final for all purposes. If referred, the President’s decision shall be final.

PART B: Graduate student procedures

Section 1 Either the Grievant or the Respondent may appeal the decision of the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies. The party wishing to appeal the decision must deliver a written appeal to the AVP Academic Affairs with copies to the opposing party. This appeal shall be delivered within fourteen (14) working days from the date of notification of the decision from the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies.

Section 2 The only ground for appeal is a substantial departure from the procedures established in this document so as to seriously prejudice the outcome.

Section 3 The appeal document shall specify the following:
A. That it is an appeal;
B. The name and current address and telephone number of the person making the appeal;
C. The reasons for the appeal and the facts supporting those reasons.

Section 4 The AVP Academic Affairs may bring final resolution to the grievance by either electing to reject the appeal based on lack of evidence, or by referring the matter to the University’s President. The AVP Academic Affairs’s decision to either reject, or refer, the appeal shall be final for all purposes. If referred, the President’s decision shall be final.

Article 8 Grounds for Disciplinary Action

Section 1 Students and faculty are subject to disciplinary action if they knowingly make false statements or act in any other way with malicious intent within the provisions of this document.
Section 2  The Presiding Officer of the Review Board (undergraduate grievances) or the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies (graduate grievances) shall immediately bring all such cases before the appropriate disciplinary bodies for review.

Article 9  Procedures for Reporting

Section 1  At the end of the academic year, the Presiding Officer of the Grievance Review Board shall report to the Academic Senate the number of undergraduate cases heard and the disposition of each case.

Section 2  At the end of the academic year, the Associate Dean of Graduate Studies shall report to the Academic Senate the number of graduate grievances that were reviewed and the disposition of each case.

Article 10  Procedures for Revision

Section 1  These procedures are subject to change by majority vote of the Academic Senate. The President is responsible for ensuring that any revisions conform to Executive Order No. 1037220 of the Office of the Chancellor.

Article 11  Proceedings Orientation

Undergraduate student procedures (no equivalent graduate student procedures)

Section 1  The Presiding Officer of the Review Board shall conduct an orientation prior to the commencement of proceedings to be attended by all Board members, the Grievant and the Respondent.

Section 2  During the orientation, the following shall be reviewed:
   A. The scope of allowable grievances as outlined in Articles 1 and 2.
   B. The rules governing the proceedings as outlined in Articles 5 and 8.
UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT GRIEVANCE FORM

A separate procedure is available for students filing a discrimination, harassment, or retaliation complaint. Those procedures and forms may be found online at http://www.csub.edu/academicprograms/Complaints%20and%20Grievances/index.html

This form is to be used by students requesting a formal hearing as outlined in the Student Complaint and Grievance Procedures. This form, when completed, must be presented to the Office of Academic Programs, Education Building, Room 242. Information and assistance in completing the grievance statement below may be obtained from the Ombudsperson in the Counseling Center.

Student Name: ___________________________ Student ID: ___________________________

Mailing Address: ___________________________ Phone: (_____) ___________________________

Email: ___________________________ Date:

Student Signature:

GRIEVANCE AGAINST THE GRADE/ACTION OF:

1. Name: ___________________________ Department: ___________________________

2. Is this grievance based on unlawful discrimination, harassment or retaliation?  
   No ☐ Yes ☐ (see first paragraph above)

3. Is this a grade grievance?  If yes, complete the following:
   Course: ___________________________ Term/Year: ___________________________ Grade Received: ___________________________

4. If this is not a grade grievance, briefly state your complaint. Attach additional sheets to this form as needed.

5. Grounds for Academic Grievance (clerical error, prejudicial evaluation, discrimination, or capricious evaluation) or grounds for Non-academic Grievance. Attach additional sheets to this form as needed.

6. Remedy sought:

7. Narrative data/factual support (include names, departments, dates, times, records, etc.) for the alleged wrong. Must attach on a separate sheet(s).

The following signatures are required. If you are unable to obtain a signature, indicate the process you have taken to obtain signatures on a separate sheet and attach directly behind this form. By signing below, all parties agree that informal efforts have been exhausted to resolve the issues being grieved.

Faculty (or Respondent) Name: ___________________________

Faculty (or Respondent) Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

Department Chair Name: ___________________________

Department Chair Signature: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________

(Signature of Dean/Administrator if not applicable)

School Dean Name: ___________________________

(Signature of Dean/Administrator if not applicable) Date: ___________________________
Academic Appeal Graduate Student Grievance Form
Graduate and Post-Baccalaureate Students

Student Name: ________________________________________  Student ID: ______________________

Address:

Street # & Name City State Zip

Telephone: ( ) ___________________________ Email: ____________________________________

Program: ___________________________ Director Name: ______________________________

Description of Request or Complaint: ________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________

Basis for Request or Complaint: _____________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________

Student Signature: _________________________________________ Date: __________________________

Required Signatures:
All the following signatures are required. If you are unable to obtain a signature, indicate the process you have taken to obtain signatures on a separate sheet and attach directly behind this form.

Program Director Signature: ___________________________ □ Recommend □ Do Not Recommend

Basis for Recommendation: _______________________________________________________________

Dean of School Signature: ___________________________ □ Recommend □ Do Not Recommend

Basis for Recommendation: _______________________________________________________________

Academic Programs Signature: ___________________________ □ Approved □ Denied

Associate Dean of Graduate Studies Signature: ___________________________ □ Approved □ Denied

Basis for Approval/Denial: _________________________________________________________________
RESOLVED: That University Handbook language and the catalog process for graduate student grievances and appeals be revised.

RATIONALE: Graduate programs are different from undergraduate programs in several ways that necessitate a unique grievance/appeals process. The current process, as outlined in the catalog, has been effective and addresses some of the unique requirements of graduate programs including (1) that the review process be timely due to the short degree time in graduate programs, (2) that the review process recognize the structure of graduate programs, (3) that the policy recognize that we have historically had an issue with programs being too lenient in response to appeals (rather than too strict) and this has sometimes threatened program certifications and accreditation, and (4) that the current policy meets the accreditation and certification requirements for our existing graduate programs.

Some changes (mostly minor) are suggested for the graduate process to more closely align the language and processes used for undergraduate and graduate processes, while still maintaining some of the differences that are necessitated by the differences between undergraduate and graduate programs.